arXiv:1611.09522v1 [math.PR] 29 Nov 2016

Gradient flow for the Boltzmann entropy and Cheeger's energy on time-dependent metric measure spaces

Eva Kopfer*

Abstract

We introduce notions of dynamic gradient flows on time-dependent metric spaces as well as on time-dependent Hilbert spaces. We prove existence of solutions for a class of time-dependent energy functionals in both settings. In particular we are interested in the case when the underlying spaces are metric measure spaces and the energy functional is given by the time-dependent Boltzmann entropy or the time-dependent Cheeger's energy. Under the assumption that each static space satisfies a lower Ricci curvature bound, we prove existence and uniqueness of the entropy gradient flow and we identify it with the forward adjoint heat flow introduced in [13]. We identify the gradient flow for the time-dependent Cheeger's energy with the heat flow introduced in [13].

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Gradient flows in metric spaces **5**

3 Dynamic gradient flows in time-dependent metric spaces **6**
3.1 Dynamic EDI- and EDE-gradient flows 9
3.2 Existence of dynamic EDI-gradient flows 13

4 Dynamic gradient flow of the entropy **21**
4.1 Time-dependent Kantorovich metrics 21
4.2 Time-dependent Boltzmann entropy 22
4.3 Existence and Uniqueness of EDE-gradient flow for the entropy . 26

5 Dynamic gradient flows in Hilbert spaces **29**
5.1 Existence and Uniqueness 30

6 The heat equation on time-dependent metric measure spaces **38**
6.1 Identification of the adjoint heat equation and the dynamic EDI-gradient flow for the entropy 40
6.2 Identification of the heat equation and the dynamic gradient flow for the Cheeger's energy 44

*Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Universität Bonn, Endenicher Allee 60, 53115 Bonn, Germany (eva.kopfer@iam.uni-bonn.de)

1 Introduction

The heat equation in $\mathbb{R}^n$

$$\partial_t u_t = \Delta u_t$$

can be interpreted as the gradient flow of the Dirichlet energy

$$Dir(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\nabla u|^2 dx \qquad (+\infty \text{ if } u \notin H^1(\mathbb{R}^n))$$

in the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$.

Since the seminal work [12] it is known that the heat equation equivalently arises as the gradient flow of the entropy functional

$$\mathrm{Ent}(\rho\mathcal{L}^n) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \rho\log\rho dx \qquad (+\infty \text{ if } \mu \text{ is not a.c. w.r.t } \mathcal{L}^n)$$

in the space $\mathcal{P}_2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of Borel probability measures with finite second moments endowed with the L^2-Kantorovich distance W_2. By now similar interpretations of the heat flow has been established in Riemannian manifolds [8], in Finsler spaces [16], in Alexandrov spaces [11] and in metric measure spaces [10]. The assumption of a lower Ricci curvature bound in the sense of Lott, Villani [15] and Sturm [20] is crucial for the existence of the entropy gradient flow.

Throughout this paper let X be a Polish space equipped with

- a 1-parameter family d_t of geodesic metrics,
- and a 1-parameter family of Borel measures such that $m_t = e^{-f_t}$ for some probability measure m and suitable function f_t.

Further we assume the following

$$|\log(d_t(x,y)/d_s(x,y))| \le L|t-s|, \quad \text{and} \quad |f_t(x) - f_s(x)| \le L^*|t-s|. \tag{1}$$

Given two probability measures with finite second moments $\mu,\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ we define for every $t \in [0,T]$ the L^2-Kantorovich distance by

$$W_t(\mu,\nu) = \inf\left\{\int_{X\times X} d_t^2(x,y)\, d\pi(x,y)\Big|\pi \text{ is a coupling of } \mu \text{ and } \nu\right\}^{1/2}.$$

The relative entropy S_t on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is defined by

$$S_t(\mu) := \int_X \rho\log\rho\, dm_t,$$

provided that μ has a density ρ with respect to m_t. We assume that each static space (X, d_t, m_t) has Ricci curvature bounded below by some $K \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. for each t and each μ,ν there exists a W_t-geodesic $(\rho_a)_{a\in[0,1]}$ connecting μ and ν such that

$$S_t(\rho_t) \le (1-a)S_t(\mu) + aS_t(\nu) - \frac{K}{2}W_t^2(\mu,\nu). \tag{2}$$

We are interested in defining a notion of gradient flows for the time-dependent entropy functional on the space of probability measures over X. For this we

adapt the discrete variational scheme to our dynamic setting, which we describe in the following. Fix a time step $h > 0$ and an initial probability measure μ_0. Recursively define for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $nh \leq T$ the minimizer μ_n^h by

$$\mu_0^h := \mu_0, \qquad \mu_n^h := \arg\min_{\nu} \left(S_{nh}(\nu) + \frac{1}{2h} W_{nh}^2(\mu_{n-1}^h, \nu) \right). \tag{3}$$

We then define a discrete trajectory as the piecewise constant interpolant $(\bar{\mu}_t^h)_{t\in[0,T]}$ by

$$\bar{\mu}_0^h := \mu_0, \qquad \bar{\mu}_t^h := \mu_n^h \text{ if } t \in ((n-1)h, nh]. \tag{4}$$

By the direct method of the calculus of variations one can prove that there exists a unique solution to (3). Having established a sequence of minimizers $(\mu_n^h)_n$ the next step is to prove the existence of a curve $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ such that $\bar{\mu}_t^h \to \mu_t$ weakly as $h \to 0$. From the convergence of the interpolants $\bar{\mu}_t^h$ to some limit curve μ_t we can deduce that μ_t satisfies a *dynamic energy dissipation equality*, in short dynamic EDE. Moreover this curve is unique.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists an absolutely continuous curve $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,T]} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ and a subsequence $h_n \to 0$ such that*

$$\bar{\mu}_t^{h_n} \to \mu_t, \text{ for every } t \in [0,T],$$

where the convergence is to be understood in duality with bounded continuous function on X. Moreover this curve satisfies

$$S_t(\mu_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}_r|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r) dr = S_0(\mu_0) + \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\mu_r) dr. \tag{5}$$

In the static metric measure space setting it is a well-known fact that the heat equation can be unambiguously defined as the gradient flow of the entropy or as the gradient flow of the Dirichlet energy. Here we prove a similar result for the adjoint heat equation from [13] under the assumption that each (X, d_t, m_t) satisfies a Riemannian curvature dimension condition.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(\mu_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ be a continuous curve in $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *(μ_t) is a gradient flow for the relative entropy,*
2. *μ_t is given by $\mu_t(dx) = \rho_t(x) m_t(dx)$, where ρ_t is a solution to the adjoint heat equation*

$$\partial_t \rho_t(x) = \Delta_t \rho_t(x) - \rho_t(x) \partial_t f_t(x).$$

For each $t \in [0,T]$ let us denote by $\mathrm{Ch}_t \colon L^2(X, m_t) \to [0, \infty]$ the Cheeger's functional

$$\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) = \frac{1}{2} \inf \left\{ \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_X (\mathrm{lip}_t u_n)^2 dm_t : u_n \in \mathrm{Lip}(X), \int |u_n - u|^2 dm_t \to 0 \right\},$$

where $\mathrm{lip}_t u$ denotes the local slope. By making use of the minimal relaxed gradient $|\nabla_t u|_*$ ([3, Definition 4.2]), this functional admits an integral representation

$$\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_X |\nabla_t u|_*^2 dm_t,$$

set equal to $+\infty$ if u has no relaxed slope. The subdifferential $D_t^-\mathrm{Ch}_t(u)$ of Ch_t at some $u \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_t)$ is the set of $v \in L^2(X, m_t)$ such that

$$\mathrm{Ch}_t(w) - \mathrm{Ch}_t(u) \geq \langle v, w-u\rangle_t \qquad \forall w \in L^2(X, m_t),$$

wher we set $\langle v, w\rangle_t = \int vw\, dm_t$. We adapt the discrete variational scheme (3) to (Ch_t) on $L^2(X)$ and prove the exitence of a dynamic gradient flow for (Ch_t). Moreover we identify the gradient flow with the heat equation introduced in [13] for spaces which satisfy a Riemannian curvature dimension condition.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\bar{u} \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch})$. Then there exists a unique gradient flow for $(\mathrm{Ch}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ starting in $\bar{u}$, i.e. an absolutely continuous curve $u\colon [0,T] \to Dom(\mathrm{Ch})$ solving*

$$\dot{u}_t \in -D_t^-\mathrm{Ch}_t(u_t) \quad \text{ for a.e. } t \in (0,T) \tag{6}$$

and $\lim_{t\to 0} u_t = \bar{u}$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\tilde{u}_t$ be the solution to the heat equation $\partial_t \tilde{u}_t = \Delta_t \tilde{u}_t$ on $(0,T)\times X$ starting in some $\bar{u} \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch})$. Then $\tilde{u}_t$ satisfies*

$$\dot{\tilde{u}}_t \in -D_t^-\mathrm{Ch}_t(\tilde{u}_t) \quad \text{ for a.e. } t \in (0,T),$$

and can be constructed as the limit of a minimizing movement scheme. Conversely, let u_t be the solution of the gradient flow of the Cheeger's functional Ch_t. Then u_t solves the heat equation

$$\partial_t u_t = \Delta_t u_t \ \text{ on } (0,T)\times X.$$

In particular $u_t = \tilde{u}_t$ in $L^2(X)$ for every $t \in [0,T]$.

Gradient flow formulations for time-dependent functionals similar to (5) and (6) have been considered recently.

In [18], Rossi, Mielke and Savaré analyze doubly nonlinear evolution equations on a reflexive Banach space V

$$\partial\psi(\dot{u}_t) + \partial E_t(u_t) \ni 0 \ \text{ in } V^* \ \text{ for a.e. } t \in (0,T).$$

They propose a formulation of a similar form as (5) and prove existence of solutions by making use of a discrete variational scheme. In [9], Ferreira and Valencia-Guevara consider the Fokker-Planck equation

$$\partial_t \rho = \kappa(t)\Delta\rho + \nabla\cdot(\nabla V(t,x)\rho) \text{ on } \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,\infty),$$

for some fixed non-increasing absolutely continuous function $\kappa\colon [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$, and potential $V\colon [0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$. They show that the solution can be obtained as the gradient flow of some specified time-dependent energy functional. They also use a version of the discrete variational scheme similar to [18] to obtain existence.

In Section 2 we briefly recall the concept of gradient flows in metric spaces. In Section 3 we introduce the notion of dynamic EDI- and dynamic EDE-gradient flows on time-dependent metric spaces $(X, d_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ satisfying (1). We show existence of dynamic EDI-gradient flows for a class of energy functionals $E\colon [0,T]\times X \to (\infty, +\infty]$. Moreover we give sufficient conditions for the

existence of EDE-gradient flows. In Section 4 we apply the results from Section 3 and prove existence and uniqueness of dynamic EDI-gradient flows in time-dependent metric measure spaces $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ for the time-dependent entropy functional $S\colon [0,T]\times\mathcal{P}(X)\to(-\infty,+\infty]$. In Section 5 we consider dynamic gradient flows in the form of (6) on time-dependent Hilbert spaces $(H, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$. We prove existence and uniqueness of such gradient flows for a class of energy functionals $E\colon [0,T]\times H\to[0,+\infty]$. In Section 6 we recall the concept of heat equation on time-dependent metric measure spaces introduced in [13]. We identify the dynamic EDI-gradient flow of the entropy with the forward adjoint heat equation. We apply the results from Section 5 and directly obtain existence and uniqueness of a dynamic gradient flow for the Cheeger's functional and identify it with the heat flow.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank my supervisor Karl-Theodor Sturm for supporting me. I also thank Peter Gladbach for helpful comments and suggestions on this paper.

2 Gradient flows in metric spaces

We briefly recall the notions of gradient flows on metric spaces (X,d). A curve $x\colon [a,b]\to X$ is said to belong to $\mathrm{AC}^p([a,b];X)$ for $1\le p\le\infty$, if there exists $g\in L^p(a,b)$ such that

$$d(x_s,x_t)\le\int_s^t g(r)dr\qquad\text{for every } a\le s\le t\le b. \tag{7}$$

The *metric speed* of x, defined by

$$|\dot{x}_t|:=\lim_{h\to0}\frac{d(x_{t+h},x_t)}{h},$$

exists for $\mathcal{L}^1$-a.e. $t\in(a,b)$, is of class $L^p(a,b)$ and is the smallest function such that (7) holds, see e.g. [1, Theorem 1.1.2].

Given $E\colon X\to(-\infty,+\infty]$ we define the *slope* $|\nabla E|(x)$ at x by

$$|\nabla E|(x):=\limsup_{y\to x}\frac{(E(x)-E(y))^+}{d(x,y)}.$$

We now are ready to give three possible definitions of gradient flows in a metric framework, cf. [2].

Definition 2.1. *1. An absolutely continuous curve $(x_t)\subset X$ is a EDI-gradient flow if it satisfies the following Energy Dissipation Inequality*

$$E(x_s)+\frac{1}{2}\int_t^s|\dot{x}_r|^2dr+\frac{1}{2}\int_t^s|\nabla E|^2(x_r)dr\le E(x_t)\quad\forall s<t. \tag{8}$$

2. An absolutely continuous curve $(x_t)\subset X$ is a EDE-gradient flow if it satisfies the following Energy Dissipation Equality

$$E(x_s)+\frac{1}{2}\int_t^s|\dot{x}_r|^2dr+\frac{1}{2}\int_t^s|\nabla E|^2(x_r)dr=E(x_t)\quad\forall s<t. \tag{9}$$

3. *An absolutely continuous curve $(x_t) \subset X$ is a EVI-gradient flow (wit respect to $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$) if it satisfies the following Evolution Variation Inequality*

$$E(x_t) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_t d^2(x_t, y) + \frac{\lambda}{2} d^2(x_t, y) \leq E(y) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0,T], \forall y \in X. \tag{10}$$

If the underlying space is a Hilbert space and the energy functional is convex, these formulations are equivalent. Moreover we can characterize the flow in terms of the subdifferential by

$$\dot{x}_t \in -D^- E(x_t), \tag{11}$$

where $D^- E(x)$ consists of all $v \in X$ such that

$$E(x) + \langle v, y - x \rangle \leq E(y) \quad \forall y \in X.$$

In this paper we are interested in finding substitutions for formulations of the form (8) and (9), where the metric as well as the functional varies in time. A formulation in the sense of (10) has already been introduced in [13]. Moreover, in the Hilbert space case, we study the time-dependent counterpart of relations of the form (11).

3 Dynamic gradient flows in time-dependent metric spaces

In the sequel we fix a 1-parameter familiy of complete geodesic metric spaces $(X, d_t)_t$ indexed by $t \in [0,T]$. We always assume that the map $t \to \log d_t(x,y)$ is Lipschitz continuous, i.e. there exists a constant L such that

$$|\log(d_t(x,y)/d_s(x,y))| \leq L|t-s|. \tag{12}$$

We give a simple example for this setting.

Example 1. *Let M be a smooth closed manifold equipped with a smooth family of Riemannian metrics (g_t) evolving under a Ricci flow, i.e.*

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_t g_t = -\mathrm{Ric}(g_t),$$

where $\mathrm{Ric}(g)$ denotes the Ricci curvature. At least for short time intervals we have existence and uniqueness of such a flow (see e.g. Theorem 5.2.1 in [22]). Under the assumption that the curvature does not blow up ($|\mathrm{Ric}| \leq L$), we have metric equivalence

$$|\partial_t \log g_t(v,v)| \leq L.$$

This implies that (12) *holds for the geodesic distance d_t.*

The metric speed

Definition 3.1. *Let $[0,T] \ni t \mapsto x_t \in X$ be a curve. We say that $(x_t) \in \mathrm{AC}^p([0,T];X)$, for $p \in [1,\infty]$, if for any (and thus for all) $t^* \in [0,T]$ there exists a function $g \in L^p(0,T)$ such that*

$$d_{t^*}(x_t, x_s) \leq \int_t^s g(r)dr \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq s \leq T \in [0,T].$$

We define the length of a curve $x\colon [0,T] \to X$ to be

$$L_x(t) = \lim_{h\to 0} \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n d_{t_j}(x_{t_j}, x_{t_{j+1}}) : 0 = t_1 < \ldots < t_n = t, t_{j+1} - t_j \leq h \right\}.$$

It is a direct consequence of the definition of $L_x(t)$ that if $x_n \to x$ pointwise as $n \to \infty$ we have $L_x(t) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} L_{x_n}(t)$ for every $t \in [0,T]$.

Note that L_x is absolutely continuous as soon as x is and hence we may define the *momentaneous speed* of the curve as the derivative of its length.

$$|\dot{x}|_t := \dot{L}_x(t).$$

Lemma 3.2. *For any curve $x \in \mathrm{AC}^p(0,T)$ the function $t \mapsto |\dot{x}|_t$ is in $L^p(0,T)$, and for almost every $t \in (0,T)$*

$$|\dot{x}|_t = \lim_{s\to t} \frac{d_t(x_s, x_t)}{|s-t|} = |\dot{x}_t|_t.$$

Proof. If we show the second assertion the first assertion is an easy consequence of (12). Let x be an absolutely continuous curve and choose an arbitrary partition $s = t_1 < t_2 < \ldots < t_{N+1} = t$. Then we find

$$\begin{aligned} d_t(x_t, x_s) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N d_{t_i}(x_{t_i}, x_{t_{i+1}}) + C\sum_{i=1}^N |t - t_i| d_t(x_{t_i}, x_{t_{i+1}}) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N d_{t_i}(x_{t_i}, x_{t_{i+1}}) + C|t-s| \int_s^t g(r)dr, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (12) and g is some L^p function. Hence we may estimate

$$d_t(x_t, x_s) \leq L(t) - L(s) + C|t-s| \int_s^t g(r)dr.$$

Dividing by $|t-s|$ and letting $s \to t$ we deduce

$$\limsup_{s\to t} \frac{d_t(x_t, x_s)}{|t-s|} \leq \dot{L}_x(t) \text{ for almost every } t.$$

We show the other inequality by contradiction. Fix $\eta > 0$ and consider the set of points

$$F = \left\{ t : \liminf_{s\to t} \left(\frac{d_t(x_s, x_t)}{|s-t|} - \frac{1}{|s-t|} \int_s^t \dot{L}_x(r)dr \right) < -\eta \right\}.$$

We assume that the Lebesgue outer measure $\mathcal{L}^*(F) > 0$. Fix $\delta > 0$ and cover the set F with intervals

$$\mathcal{F} := \bigcup_{t\in F}(t-\delta_t, t+\delta_t), \text{ where } \delta_t < \delta,$$

such that

$$d_t(x_t, x_s) < \int_s^t \dot{L}_x(r)dr - |t-s|\eta/2 \tag{13}$$

for all $t \in F$ and some $s \in (t-\delta_t, t+\delta_t)$. From the Besicovitch covering theorem [6, Theorem 5.8.1] it follows that there exists a constant N and a subcollection $\mathcal{F}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{F}_N$ each consisting of at most countably many disjoint intervals B such that

$$F \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{F}_i} B.$$

Since the outer measure of F is strictly positive we can find a familiy $\mathcal{F}_j$ of at most countably many disjoint intervals denoted by $\mathcal{F}_j = \{(t_i-\delta_i, t_i+\delta_i), i \in I\}$ such that $\mathcal{L}^1(\bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{F}_j} B) \geq \frac{1}{N}\mathcal{L}^*(F) > 0$.

We define a curve $x^\delta \colon [0,T] \to X$ in the following way

$$x_t^\delta = \begin{cases} x_{t_i} & \text{if } t \in (t_i, t_i+\delta_i) \\ x_t & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Note that this curve is not continuous but still its length is finite. Further we observe that x_t^δ converges to x_t pointwise as δ goes to 0 and hence

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 0} L_{x^\delta}(T) \geq L_x(T).$$

It suffices to show that

$$L_{x^\delta}(T) \leq L_x(T)(1+L\delta) - \frac{\eta}{2}\mathcal{L}^1\left(\bigcup_{i\in I}(t_i, t_i+\delta_i)\right), \tag{14}$$

since then

$$L_x(T) \leq \liminf_{\delta\to 0} L_{x^\delta}(T) \leq L_x(T) - \frac{\eta}{4N}\mathcal{L}^*(F) < L_x(T),$$

which is clearly a contradiction. Hence for the outer measure it must hold $\mathcal{L}^*(F) = 0$ and therefore already $\mathcal{L}^1(F) = 0$. Since L_x is absolutely continuous we conclude

$$\liminf_{s\to t} \frac{d_t(x_s, x_t)}{|s-t|} \geq \dot{L}_x(t) \text{ for almost every } t \in [0,T].$$

It remains to show (14). Take a partition $(p_j)_{j=1}^m$ of $[0,T]$, with $0 < p_{j+1} - p_j \leq h$ and $h << \delta$. Consider the points near the boundary of $(t_i, t_i+\delta_i)$

$$j_i^{\leq} := \max\{j | p_j \leq t_i, 1 \leq j \leq m\}, \quad j_i^{\geq} = \min\{j | p_{j+1} \geq t_i+\delta_i, 1 \leq j \leq m\}.$$

Since x is absolutely continuous we can estimate

$$d_{p_{j_i^{\leq}}}(x^\delta_{p_{j_i^{\leq}}}, x^\delta_{p_{j_i^{\leq}+1}}) = d_{p_{j_i^{\leq}}}(x_{p_{j_i^{\leq}}}, x_{t_i}) \leq \int_{p_{j_i^{\leq}}}^{p_{j_i^{\leq}}+h} g(r)dr,$$

where $g \in L^p(0,T)$. Applying (13), (12) and again the absolute continuity we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&d_{p_{j_i^{\geq}}}(x^\delta_{p_{j_i^{\geq}}}, x^\delta_{p_{j_i^{\geq}+1}}) = d_{p_{j_i^{\geq}}}(x_{t_i}, x_{p_{j_i^{\geq}+1}}) \\
&\leq d_{p_{j_i^{\geq}}}(x_{t_i}, x_{t_i+\delta_i}) + d_{p_{j_i^{\geq}}}(x_{t_i+\delta_i}, x_{p_{j_i^{\geq}+1}}) \\
&\leq d_{t_i}(x_{t_i}, x_{t_i+\delta_i})(1+L\delta_i) + \int_{t_i+\delta_i}^{t_i+\delta_i+h} g(r)dr \\
&\leq \int_{t_i}^{t_i+\delta_i} (\dot{L}_x(r) - \eta/2)dr(1+L\delta_i) + \int_{t_i+\delta_i}^{t_i+\delta_i+h} g(r)dr.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all partitions (p_j) and letting $h \to 0$ we can estimate the length of the curve x^δ

$$\begin{aligned}
L_{x^\delta}(T) &\leq \int_{(0,T)\setminus\bigcup_i (t_i,t_i+\delta_i)} \dot{L}_x(r)dr + \sum_i \int_{t_i}^{t_i+\delta_i} (\dot{L}_x(r) - \eta/2)dr(1+C^*\delta_i) \\
&\leq \int_{(0,T)} \dot{L}_x(r)dr(1+L\delta) - \eta/2\mathcal{L}^1\left(\bigcup_i (t_i, t_i+\delta_i)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (14).

□

The slope

Definition 3.3. *Let $E\colon [0,T]\times X \to (-\infty,+\infty]$ and $s,t\in[0,T]$, $x\in X$ with $E_t(x)<\infty$. Then the* slope $|\nabla_s E_t|(x)$ *of E_t with respect to d_s is given by*

$$|\nabla_s E_t|(x) = \limsup_{y\to x} \frac{[E_t(x)-E_t(y)]^+}{d_s(x,y)} = \limsup_{y\to x} \max\left\{\frac{E_t(x)-E_t(y)}{d_s(x,y)}, 0\right\}.$$

We mainly deal with the case $t=s$ in the definition of the slope. We estimate the deviation of the d_t slope from the d_s slope in the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $s,t\in[0,T]$ and $x\in X$ such that $E_t(x)<\infty$ and $|\nabla_s E_t|(x)<\infty$. Then we have*

$$||\nabla_t E_t|(x) - |\nabla_s E_t|(x)| \leq L|t-s||\nabla_s E_t|(x).$$

Proof. This follows from (12) and $\log r \leq r-1$ and $\log(r^{-1}) \geq 1-r$ respectively. □

3.1 Dynamic EDI- and EDE-gradient flows

Let us first motivate the definition of dynamic EDI-gradient flows by considering a Hilbert space X endowed with a family of scalar products $(\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_t)$ depending

smoothly on t. Let $E_t\colon X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a $\mathcal{C}^1$ functional also smoothly depending on time. In this setting we understand a gradient flow as a curve solving

$$\dot{x}_t = -\nabla_t E_t(x_t). \tag{15}$$

Let us observe that (15) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d}{dt}E_t(x_t) \leq -\frac{1}{2}|\nabla_t E_t|_t^2(x_t) - \frac{1}{2}|\dot{x}_t|_t^2 + (\partial_t E_t)(x_t), \tag{16}$$

where $(\partial_t E_t)(x_t)$ stands for $\frac{d}{ds}E_s(x_t)\Big|_{s=t}$. Indeed, along any differentiable curve it holds

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}E_t(x_t) &= \frac{d}{ds}E_s(x_t)\Big|_{s=t} + \langle \nabla_t E_t(x_t), \dot{x}_t\rangle_t \\ &\geq \frac{d}{ds}E_s(x_t)\Big|_{s=t} - \frac{1}{2}|\nabla_t E_t|_t^2(x_t) - \frac{1}{2}|\dot{x}_t|_t^2,\end{aligned}$$

and we have equality if and only if (15) holds. The functional's dependence on the time variable leads to a "drift" of the gradient flow, i.e. in some sense the gradient flow does not follow the steepest descent. To illustrate this we give an example about the asymptotic behaviour.

Example 2. *Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $d_t = |x - y|$ for $t \in [0, \infty)$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. We consider the energy $E_t(x) = (x - t)^2$ and the curve $x_t = e^{-2t} + t - \frac{1}{2}$. Note that*

$$\dot{x}_t = -2e^{-2t} + 1 = -2(x_t - t) = -\partial_x E_t(x),$$

and hence (x_t) is a gradient flow. A well-known fact in the theory of gradient flows is that for strictly convex functionals the gradient flow converges to the minimum of the functional as $t \to \infty$, see e.g. [1, Theorem 3.1(v)]. In our case the minima depend on time and are given by $x_t^{\min} = t$. Hence

$$|x_t - x_t^{\min}| = |e^{-2t} - 1/2|,$$

which obviously does not converge to 0 as $t \to \infty$.

Let us now come back to our original family of complete, geodesic, metric spaces (X, d_t) such that (12) holds true. We call a measurable functional E on $[0, T] \times X$ *admissable* if it satisfies the following assumptions.

(A1) The domain $Dom(E_t) := \{x \in X | E_t(x) < \infty\}$ is time-independent and nonempty.

(A2) $E_t(x)$ is uniformly bounded from below.

(A3a) For each $t \in [0, T]$, $x \mapsto E_t(x)$ is lower semicontinuous.

(A4) The map $t \mapsto E_t(x)$ is uniformly Lipschitz continuous, i.e. there exists a constant L^* such that

$$|E_t(x) - E_s(x)| \leq L^*|t - s| \quad \forall t, s \in [0, T], x \in Dom(E),$$

and the set of differentiability points of the map $t \mapsto E_t(x)$ can be chosen regardless of $x \in X$ as soon as $x \in Dom(E)$.

Note that the Lipschitz continuity of the map $t \mapsto E_t(x)$ provides a.e. differentiability in t for every fixed x. But this is not enough to get a meaningful expression in (16), since we may have that for some absolutely continuous curve (x_t), $t \mapsto E_t$ is not differentiable at x_t for every t. To circumvent this problem we suppose that the set of differentiability points can be chosen independ of x, cf. [9, 18]. To illustrate this we give the following example, which has also been discussed in [18].

Example 3. *Let $X = \mathbb{R}$ and $d_t(x, y) = |x - y|$ for every $t \in [0, T]$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Consider the following energy functional $E\colon [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty)$ given by*

$$E_t(x) = |x - t|.$$

Then the map $t \mapsto E_t(x)$ is clearly Lipschitz continuous with well-defined derivative $\partial_t E_t(x)$ as long as $t \in [0, T] \setminus \{x\}$. If we choose the curve $(x_t)_{t\in[0,T]} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty([0, T])$ by setting $x_t = t$, the map $s \mapsto E_s(x_t)$ is not differentiable at any $t \in [0, T]$. Indeed, for every $t \in [0, T]$ the right derivative $\partial_s E_s(x_t)_{|s=t+}$ equals 1, while the left derivative $\partial_s E_s(x_t)_{|s=t-}$ equals -1.

Definition 3.5. *We call a locally absolutely continuous curve $x\colon [0, T] \to X$ a dynamic EDI-gradient flow for an admissable functional $E\colon [0, T] \times X \to (-\infty, \infty]$, if for every $t \in [0, T]$*

$$E_t(x_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{x}|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r E_r|^2(x_r)dr \le E_0(x_0) + \int_0^t (\partial_r E_r)(x_r)dr, \quad (17)$$

where we used the shorthand notation $(\partial_t E_t)(x_t) = \frac{d}{dr}E_r(x_t)|_{r=t}$. We call a locally absolute continuous curve $x\colon [0, T] \to X$ a dynamic EDE-gradient flow for an admissable functional $E\colon [0, T] \times X \to (-\infty, \infty]$, if for every $t \in [0, T]$

$$E_t(x_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{x}|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r E_r|^2(x_r)dr = E_0(x_0) + \int_0^t (\partial_r E_r)(x_r)dr, \quad (18)$$

Clearly, (18) implies (17). In the following we want to give sufficient conditions for the other implication.

Definition 3.6. *We say that the above mentioned functional E is K-convex for $K \in \mathbb{R}$, if for every $t \in [0, T]$ and for any pair of points $x, y \in Dom(E)$ there exists a d_t-geodesic $(\gamma_a)_{a\in[0,1]}$ connecting x and y such that for all $a \in [0, 1]$*

$$E_t(\gamma_a) \le (1 - a)E_t(\gamma_0) + aE_t(\gamma_1) - K\frac{a(1 - a)}{2}d_t^2(\gamma_0, \gamma_1). \quad (19)$$

The convexity assumption allows us to reformulate the slope

$$|\nabla_t E_t|(x) = \sup_{y\neq x}\left[\frac{E_t(x) - E_t(y)}{d_t(x, y)} + \frac{K^-}{2}d_t(x, y)\right]^+, \quad (20)$$

with $K^- := \max\{0, -K\}$, cf. [2, Theorem 2.4.9].

The next proposition can be thought of as a weak chain rule in the sense of [1, Proposition 3.19]. The convexity of the functional plays an important role in the proof of this result. Unlike in the static case we additionally have to impose a condition on the difference quotients of the functionals, cf. [9, Theorem 5.4].

Proposition 3.7. *Let $E\colon [0,T]\times X\to(-\infty,+\infty]$ be a K-convex admissable functional. Moreover assume that for almost every $t\in[0,T]$*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{E_{t_n}(x_n)-E_t(x_n)}{t_n-t}\geq\partial_t E_t(x),\ \text{if } t_n\searrow t,\ x_n\overset{d}{\to}x \text{ as } n\to\infty. \tag{21}$$

Then for every locally absolutely continuous curve $(x_t)\subset Dom(E)$, the function $t\mapsto E_t(x_t)$ is absolutely continuous and it holds

$$E_t(x_t)-E_s(x_s)\geq\int_s^t(\partial_r E_r)(x_r)\,dr-\int_s^t|\dot{x}|_r|\nabla_r E_r|(x_r)\,dr,\quad s<t. \tag{22}$$

In particular, if (x_t) is a dynamic EDI-gradient flow, it is a dynamic EDE-gradient flow as well.

Proof. In view of [2, Lemma 1.1.4(a)] we can find an increasing and absolutely continuous map $\boldsymbol{s}\colon[0,T]\to[0,L]$, whose inverse $\boldsymbol{t}$ is Lipschitz. The reparametrization $\hat{x}_{\boldsymbol{s}(t)}:=x(t)$ satisfies $|\dot{\hat{x}}_s|_{t^*}\leq 1$ for almost every $s\in[0,L]$ with respect to some fixed metric d_{t^*}. Notice that it is sufficient to prove that $s\mapsto E_{\boldsymbol{t}(s)}(\hat{x}_s)=:\varphi(s)$ is absolutely continuous, as then $E_t(x_t)=E_t(\hat{x}_{\boldsymbol{s}(t)})$ is absolutely continuous and for almost every $t\in[0,T]$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}E_t(x_t)&=\lim_{h\to0}\frac{E_{t+h}(x_{t+h})-E_t(x_t)}{h}\\
&\geq\liminf_{h\to0}\frac{E_{t+h}(x_{t+h})-E_t(x_{t+h})}{h}+\liminf_{h\to0}\frac{E_t(x_{t+h})-E_t(x_t)}{d_t(x_{t+h},x_t)}\frac{d_t(x_{t+h},x_t)}{h}\\
&\geq\partial_t E_t(x_t)-\limsup_{h\to0}\frac{[E_t(x_t)-E_t(x_{t+h})]^+}{d_t(x_{t+h},x_t)}\frac{d_t(x_{t+h},x_t)}{h}\\
&\geq\partial_t E_t(x_t)-|\nabla_t E_t|(x_t)|\dot{x}|_t,
\end{aligned}$$

where we used (21) in the third inequality. After integration we obtain (22).

In view of the convexity of E we may use the representation formula of the slope (20) and write using $a^+\leq(a+b)^++b^-$ and the Lipschitz property of the functional

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(s_1)-\varphi(s_0)&\leq|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_1)}E_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_1)}|(\hat{x}_{s_1})d_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_1)}(\hat{x}_{s_1},\hat{x}_{s_0})\\
&\quad+\frac{K^-}{2}d^2_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_1)}(\bar{x}_{s_1},\hat{x}_{s_0})+L^*|s_1-s_2|\\
&\leq\Big(|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_1)}E_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_1)}|(\hat{x}_{s_1})+\frac{K^-}{2}D\Big)e^C|s_1-s_0|+L^*|s_1-s_0|,
\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

where D is the finite diameter of the image $\{\hat{x}_s\}_s$ with respect to $d_{\boldsymbol{t}}$. Changing the roles of s_0 and s_1 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\varphi(s_1)-\varphi(s_0)|\\
&\leq\Big(|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_1)}E_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_1)}|(\hat{x}_{s_1})+|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_0)}E_{\boldsymbol{t}(s_0)}|(\hat{x}_{s_0})+\frac{K^-}{2}D\Big)e^C|t-s|+L^*|t-s|.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying [2, Lemma 1.2.6] we conclude that the map $s\mapsto\varphi(s)$ is in the Sobolev space $W^{1,1}(0,L)$. To prove absolute continuity we simply check that it coincides

with its continuous representative. We already know that $s \mapsto \varphi(s)$ is lower semicontinuous and therefore continuity follws if we show

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \varphi(s+r)dr \leq \varphi(s) \quad \forall s \in (0, L).$$

This can be seen by applying (23) once more and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \varphi(s+r) - \varphi(s)\, dr \\
\leq &\limsup_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \Big(|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{t}(s+r)} E_{\boldsymbol{t}(s+r)}|(\hat{x}_{s+r}) + \frac{K^-}{2} D \Big) e^C |r| + L^* |r| dr \\
\leq &\limsup_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \Big(|\nabla_{\boldsymbol{t}(s+r)} E_{\boldsymbol{t}(s+r)}|(\hat{x}_{s+r}) + \frac{K^-}{2} D) e^C + L^* dr = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

3.2 Existence of dynamic EDI-gradient flows

We are interested in the following problem.

Problem 1. *Given a function $E\colon X \times [0,T] \to (-\infty, +\infty]$, and an initial value $\bar{x} \in Dom(E)$, find an EDI-gradient flow (x_t) for E.*

Under suitable topological assumptions we will find a gradient flow for suitable energy functionals using the minimizing movement scheme, which we describe in the subsequent sections.

Topological assumptions

As before, we are dealing with a time-dependent complete geodesic metric space $(X, d_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ such that (12) hold true. Additionally we impose a topology σ on X such that σ is weaker than the topology induced by (d_t) and d_t is sequentially σ-lower semicontinuous, i.e.

$$\text{if } x_n \xrightarrow{\sigma} x \text{ and } y_n \xrightarrow{\sigma} y, \text{ then } \liminf_{n\to\infty} d_t(x_n, y_n) \geq d_t(x, y) \text{ for every } t \in [0,T].$$

Let $E\colon [0,T] \times X \to (-\infty, \infty]$ be a functional satisfying **A1**, **A2**, and **A4**. We will extend our assumptions by the following.

A5 If $(x_n) \subset X$ with $\sup_{n,m} d_t(x_n, x_m) < \infty$, then (x_n) admits a σ-convergent subsequence.

A3b For each $t \in [0,T]$, $x \mapsto E_t(x)$ is sequentially σ-lower semicontinuous.

Approximation

We fix a time step $h > 0$ and subdivide the interval $[0,T]$ into

$$\mathcal{P}_h := \{t_0 = 0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_{N-1} < T \leq t_N\}, \qquad t_n = nh, N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For $0 \le t \le T$ we define the piecewise constant interpolants $\overline{h}(t)$ and $\underline{h}(t)$ associated with the partition $\mathcal{P}_h$ in the following way;

$$\overline{h}(0) = 0 = \underline{h}(0), \text{ and for } t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n] \quad \overline{h}(t) = t_n, \quad \underline{h}(t) = t_{n-1}. \tag{24}$$

The definition implies that $\overline{h}(t) \searrow t$ and $\underline{h}(t) \nearrow t$ if $h \searrow 0$.

For a given initial value $\bar{x}$ we recursively define a sequence (x_n^h) of minimizers by

$$x_0^h := \bar{x}, \qquad x_n^h := \arg\min_x \Big\{ E_{t_n}(x) + \frac{1}{2h} d_{t_n}^2(x, x_{n-1}^h) \Big\} \tag{25}$$

Proposition 3.8. *For every $\bar{x} \in Dom(E)$ and $h > 0$ there exists a solution to the minimization problem* (25)*.*

Proof. Existence follows by the direct method of calculus. Define

$$\phi(h, \bar{x}, t; \cdot) := E_t(\cdot) + \frac{1}{2h} d_t^2(\bar{x}, \cdot).$$

Since E is uniformly bounded from below we may take a minimizing sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $d_t^2(x_n, \bar{x})$ remains bounded uniformly in n. From the triangle inequality we deduce that $\sup_{n,m} d_t(x_n, x_m) < \infty$. Hence **A5** guarantees existence of a σ-convergent subsequence x_{n_k}. The weak limit point $x \in Dom(E)$ is a minimizer of $\phi(h, \bar{x}, t; \cdot)$, which is due to the σ-lower semicontinuity of the distance and the functional. □

Definition 3.9. *Fix $h > 0$ and let $s \in [0, T-h]$. For $0 < r < T - s$ define*

$$J_{s,r}(y) := \min_x \Big\{ E_{s+r}(x) + \frac{1}{2r} d_{s+h}^2(x, y) \Big\}, \tag{26}$$

$$A_{s,r}(y) := \arg\min_x \Big\{ E_{s+r}(x) + \frac{1}{2r} d_{s+h}^2(x, y) \Big\}. \tag{27}$$

Lemma 3.10. *For $x_r \in A_{s,r}(y)$ we have*

$$|\nabla_{s+h} E_{s+r}|(x_r) \le \frac{1}{r} d_{s+h}(x_r, y)$$

and for $0 < r_1 < r_2 < T - s$

$$d_{s+h}^2(x_{r_1}, y) \le d_{s+h}^2(x_{r_2}, y) + 4 r_1 r_2 L^*. \tag{28}$$

Proof. By optimality of x_r we have for every $x \in X$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{E_{s+r}(x_r) - E_{s+r}(x)}{d_{s+h}(x_r, x)} &\le \frac{d_{s+h}^2(x, y) - d_{s+h}^2(x_r, y)}{2r d_{s+h}(x_r, x)} \\ = &\frac{(d_{s+h}(x, y) - d_{s+h}(x_r, y))(d_{s+h}(x, y) + d_{s+h}(x_r, y))}{2r d_{s+h}(x_r, x)} \\ \le &\frac{(d_{s+h}(x, y) + d_{s+h}(x_r, y))}{2r} \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limsup as $x \to x_r$ we get the assertion. To show the second assertion note that on the one hand we have

$$E_{s+r_1}(x_{r_1}) + \frac{1}{2r_1} d_{s+h}^2(x_{r_1}, y) \le E_{s+r_1}(x_{r_2}) + \frac{1}{2r_1} d_{s+h}^2(x_{r_2}, y),$$

and on the other

$$E_{s+r_2}(x_{r_2}) + \frac{1}{2r_2} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_2}, y) \leq E_{s+r_2}(x_{r_1}) + \frac{1}{2r_2} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_1}, y).$$

Adding these two inequalities, using the Lipschitz property of $t \mapsto E_t(x)$ and dividing by $\frac{1}{2r_1} - \frac{1}{2r_2}$ yields (28). □

Lemma 3.11. *The map $r \mapsto J_{s,r}(y)$ is locally Lipschitz and for almost every $r \in (0, T-s)$ we have for $x_r \in A_{s,r}(y)$*

$$\frac{d}{dr} J_{s,r}(y) = -\frac{1}{2r^2} d^2_{s+h}(x_r, y) + (\partial_r E_{s+r})(x_r). \tag{29}$$

Proof. Fix $0 < r_1 < r_2 < T - s$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} J_{s,r_2}(y) - J_{s,r_1}(y) =& E_{s+r_2}(x_{r_2}) - E_{s+r_1}(x_{r_1}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2r_2} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_2}, y) - \frac{1}{2r_1} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_1}, y) \\ \leq& E_{s+r_2}(x_{r_1}) - E_{s+r_1}(x_{r_1}) + \frac{r_1 - r_2}{2r_2 r_1} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_1}, y) \\ \leq& L^*(r_2 - r_1) - \frac{r_2 - r_1}{2r_2 r_1} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_1}, y), \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where L^* denotes the Lipschitz constant from **A4**. Conversely, changing the roles of x_{r_1} and x_{r_2}, we obtain

$$J_{s,r_2}(y) - J_{s,r_1}(y) \geq -L^*(r_2 - r_1) - \frac{r_2 - r_1}{2r_2 r_1} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_2}, y).$$

Combining these two inequalities yields

$$|J_{s,r_2}(y) - J_{s,r_1}(y)| \leq L^* |r_2 - r_1| + \frac{|r_2 - r_1|}{2r_1 r_2} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_2}, y),$$

which means $r \mapsto J_{s,r}(y)$ is locally Lipschitz. Dividing by $r_2 - r_1$ and letting $r_1 \to r_2$ in (30) yields on the one hand for the left derivative

$$\frac{d^-}{dr} J_{s,r}(y) \leq -\frac{1}{2r^2} d^2_{s+h}(x_r, y) + (\partial_r E_{s+r})(x_r),$$

for every differentiability point r of $r \mapsto E_{t+r}$. On the other hand we obtain similarly for the right derivative

$$\frac{d^+}{dr} J_{s,r}(y) \geq -\frac{1}{2r^2} d^2_{s+h}(x_r, y) + (\partial_r E_{s+r})(x_r),$$

for every differentiability point of $r \mapsto E_{t+r}$. By local Lipschitz continuity we have for a.e. $0 < r < T - s$

$$\frac{d}{dr} J_{s,r}(\nu) = -\frac{1}{2r^2} d^2_{s+h}(x_r, y) + (\partial_r E_{s+r})(x_r).$$

□

Lemma 3.12. *For $s \in [0,T]$ and $0 < r_1 < r_2 < T - s$*

$$E_s(y) \geq J_{s,r_1}(y) - Cr_1 \geq J_{s,r_2}(y) - Cr_2 \tag{31}$$

$$\lim_{r\to 0} d_{s+h}(y, x_r) = 0 \text{ if } y \in Dom(E). \tag{32}$$

In particular $\lim_{r\to 0} J_{s,r}(y) = E_s(y)$.

Proof. The first inequality in (31) directly follows from

$$E_{s+r_1}(x_{r_1}) + \frac{1}{2r_1} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_1}, y) \leq E_{s+r_1}(y) \leq E_s(y) + L^* r_1.$$

The second one follows by

$$\begin{aligned} E_{s+r_1}(x) + \frac{1}{2r_1} d^2_{s+h}(x,y) &\geq E_{s+r_1}(x) + \frac{1}{2r_2} d^2_{s+h}(x,y) \\ &\geq E_{s+r_2}(x) + \frac{1}{2r_2} d^2_{s+h}(x,y) - L^*(r_2 - r_1), \end{aligned}$$

and minimizing over all x. Since for every $x \in Dom(E)$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq d^2_{s+h}(y, x_r) &\leq -2rE_{s+r}(x_r) + d^2_{s+h}(y,x) + 2rE_{s+r}(x) \\ &\leq -2r \inf E + d^2_{s+h}(y,x) + 2rE_{s+r}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit $r \to 0$

$$\lim_{r\to 0} d^2_{s+h}(x_r, y) \leq d^2_{s+h}(x,y) \text{ for every } x \in Dom(E).$$

Since $y \in Dom(E)$ we conclude (32). To check the last one we combine (31) with the lower semicontinuity of $x \mapsto E_t(x)$,

$$E_t(y) \geq \limsup_{r\to 0} J_{t,r}(y) \geq \liminf_{r\to 0} E_{t+r}(x_r) \geq E_t(y).$$

□

Corollary 3.13. *For every $0 < r_0 < T - s$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{s+r_0}(x_{r_0}) + \frac{1}{2r_0} d^2_{s+h}(x_{r_0}, y) \\ &= E_s(y) - \int_0^{r_0} \frac{1}{2r^2} d^2_{s+h}(x_r, y) dr + \int_0^{r_0} (\partial_r E_{s+r})(x_r) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Proof. Integrate (29) from 0 to r_0 and use that $\lim_{r\to 0} J_{s,r}(y) = E_s(y)$. □

In the following we introduce dynamic counterparts for the variational interpolation, the discrete speed and the discrete slope, cf. [2, 18].

Definition 3.14. *Let $\bar{x} \in Dom(E)$ be the initial value and x^h_n be a sequence defined by the minimization problem* (25). *A* discrete solution *is a curve $t \mapsto \bar{x}^h_t$ defined by*

$$\bar{x}^h_t = x^h_n, \text{ for } t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n],$$

and $\bar{x}_0^h = \bar{x}$.
A variational interpolation *is a map* $t \to \tilde{x}_t^h$ *defined by*

$$\tilde{x}_t^h = \arg\min\Big\{E_t(x) + \frac{1}{2r} d_{t_n}^2(x, x_{n-1}^h)\Big\},$$
$$\text{for } t = t_{n-1} + r \in (t_{n-1}, t_n],$$

and $\tilde{x}_0^h = \bar{x}$.
We define the discrete speed $Dsp^h\colon [0,T] \to [0,\infty)$ *and the* discrete slope $Dsl^h\colon [0,T] \to [0,\infty)$ *in the following way*

$$Dsp_r^h = \frac{1}{h} d_{t_n}(\bar{x}_{t_n}^h, \bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h), \quad r \in (t_{n-1}, t_n],$$
$$Dsl_r^h = \frac{1}{(r - t_{n-1})} d_{t_n}(\bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h, \tilde{x}_r^h), \quad r \in (t_{n-1}, t_n].$$

Note that $\tilde{x}_{t_n}^h = x_n^h = \bar{x}_{t_n}^h$.

Proposition 3.15. *We have for* $0 \le s \le t \le T$

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{\overline{h}(t)}(\bar{x}_t^h) + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\overline{h}(s)}^{\overline{h}(t)} (Dsp_r^h)^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\overline{h}(s)}^{\overline{h}(t)} (Dsl_r^h)^2 dr \\ &\quad = E_{\overline{h}(s)}(\bar{x}_s^h) + \int_{\overline{h}(s)}^{\overline{h}(t)} (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}_r^h) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Proof. Let $t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n]$. We want to apply equation (33) with $s = t_{n-1}$, $r_0 = t - s$, $y = x_{n-1}^h$. Then with $x_{r_0} = \tilde{x}_t^h$ and $x_r = \tilde{x}_{t_{n-1}+r}^h$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} &E_t(\tilde{x}_t^h) + \frac{1}{2(t - t_{n-1})} d_{t_n}^2(\tilde{x}_t^h, x_{n-1}^h) + \int_{t_{n-1}}^t \frac{1}{2(r - t_{n-1})^2} d_{t_n}^2(x_{n-1}^h, \tilde{x}_r^h) dr \\ &\quad = E_{t_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}^h) + \int_{t_{n-1}}^t (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}_r^h) dr. \end{aligned}$$

For $t = t_n$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{t_n}(\bar{x}_{t_n}^h) + \frac{1}{2h^2}\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} d_{t_n}^2(\bar{x}_{t_n}^h, \bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h) dr + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \frac{1}{2(r - t_{n-1})^2} d_{t_n}^2(\bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h, \tilde{x}_r^h) dr \\ &\quad = E_{t_{n-1}}(\bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h) + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}_r^h) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Summing up from $n+1$ to m yields

$$\begin{aligned} &E_{t_m}(\bar{x}_{t_m}^h) + \frac{1}{2h^2}\sum_{j=n+1}^m \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} d_{t_j}^2(\bar{x}_{t_j}^h, \bar{x}_{t_{j-1}}^h) dr \\ &+ \sum_{j=n+1}^m \int_{t_{j-1}}^{t_j} \frac{1}{2(r - t_{j-1})^2} d_{t_j}^2(\bar{x}_{t_{j-1}}^h, \tilde{x}_r^h) dr = E_{t_n}(\bar{x}_{t_n}^h) + \int_{t_n}^{t_m} (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}_r^h) dr. \end{aligned}$$

Now plugging in the definitions of the discrete slope and the discrete speed respectively

$$\begin{aligned} E_{t_m}(\bar{x}^h_{t_m}) + \frac{1}{2}\int_{t_n}^{t_m} (Dsp^h_r)^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_{t_n}^{t_m} (Dsl^h_r)^2 dr \\ = E_{t_n}(\bar{x}^h_{t_n}) + \int_{t_n}^{t_m} (\partial E_r)(\tilde{x}^h_r) dr, \end{aligned}$$

which shows (34).

□

Remark 3.16. *Alternatively, for $t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n]$ we can write*

$$\begin{aligned} E_t(\tilde{x}^h_t) + \frac{1}{2(t-t_{n-1})} d^2_{t_n}(\tilde{x}^h_t, \tilde{x}^h_{t_{n-1}}) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{t_{n-1}} (Dsp^h_r)^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t (Dsl^h_r)^2 dr \\ = E_0(\bar{x}) + \int_0^t (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}^h_r) dr. \end{aligned}$$

The following proposition provides essential a priori bounds.

Proposition 3.17. *There exist constants C_1, C_2, C_3 such that for all $0 \le t, mh \le T$*

$$E_t(\tilde{x}^h_t) \le C_1, \tag{36}$$

$$\frac{1}{2h}\sum_{n=1}^{m} d^2_{t_n}(\bar{x}^h_{t_n}, \bar{x}^h_{t_{n-1}}) \le C_2, \tag{37}$$

$$d^2_{t^*}(\tilde{x}^h_t, \bar{x}^h_t) \le C_3 h, \text{ for some fixed } t^*. \tag{38}$$

Proof. From Remark 3.16 we deduce

$$E_t(\tilde{x}^h_t) \le E_0(\bar{x}) + L^* T,$$

which shows (36).

We drop the nonnegative slope term in equation (35) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2h} d^2_{t_n}(\bar{x}^h_{t_n}, \bar{x}^h_{t_{n-1}}) \le E_{t_{n-1}}(\bar{x}^h_{t_{n-1}}) - E_{t_n}(\bar{x}^h_{t_n}) + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}^h_r) dr.$$

Summing up to m and applying the Lipschitz property of $t \mapsto E_t$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2h}\sum_{n=1}^{m} d^2_{t_n}(\bar{x}^h_{t_n}, \bar{x}^h_{t_{n-1}}) &\le E_{t_0}(\bar{x}^h_{t_0}) - E_{t_m}(\bar{x}^h_{t_m}) + \int_{t_0}^{t_{m-1}} (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}^h_r) dr \\ &\le E_{t_0}(\bar{x}^h_{t_0}) - E_{t_m}(\bar{x}^h_{t_m}) + TL^*, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain on the one hand

$$E_{t_m}(\bar{x}^h_{t_m}) \le E_{t_0}(\bar{x}^h_{t_0}) + TL^*,$$

and since $\inf E(x) > -\infty$

$$\frac{1}{2h}\sum_{n=1}^{m} d^2_{t_n}(\bar{x}^h_{t_n}, \bar{x}^h_{t_{n-1}}) \le C_2.$$

To show (38) note that for $t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n]$

$$\begin{aligned} d^2_{t_n}(\tilde{x}^h_t, \bar{x}^h_t) = d^2_{t_n}(\tilde{x}^h_t, x^h_n) &\leq 2d^2_{t_n}(\tilde{x}^h_t, x^h_{n-1}) + 2d^2_{t_n}(x^h_{n-1}, x^h_n) \\ &\leq 4d^2_{t_n}(\mu^h_n, \mu^h_{n-1}) + 8(t - t_{n-1})hC, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality is a consequenc of (28). Applying (37) and (12) we conclude (38). □

Proposition 3.18. *There exists a subsequence h_n with $\lim_n h_n = 0$, a curve $(x_t) \subset \mathrm{AC}^2([0,T]; X)$ and a function $A \in L^2(0,T)$ such that*

$$\bar{x}^{h_n}_t \overset{\sigma}{\rightharpoonup} x_t, \quad \tilde{x}^{h_n}_t \overset{\sigma}{\rightharpoonup} x_t \text{ for all } t,$$

$$\text{and } |Dsp^{h_n}| \rightharpoonup A \text{ weakly in } L^2(0,T).$$

Further $|\dot{x}|_t \leq A(t)$ holds almost everywhere.

Proof. We want to apply a refined version of Arzelà-Ascoli [2, Proposition 3.3.1] to the family $(\bar{x}^h)_{h>0}$. Owing to the estimates (12) and (37) we have

$$d_{t^*}(\bar{x}^h_t, \bar{x}) \leq tC_2 e^C,$$

and together with **A5** this yields that the curves $\bar{x}^h \colon [0,T] \to X$ take values in a σ-sequentially compact set. From the estimate (37) we further deduce

$$\int_t^s |Dsp^h_r|^2 dr \leq \sum_{j=t_n}^{t_m} \frac{1}{h} d^2_{t_j}(\bar{x}^h_{t_j}, \bar{x}^h_{t_{j-1}}) \leq 2C_2,$$

for $\overline{h}(s) = t_m$, $\underline{h}(t) = t_n$. Applying the Banach Alaoglu Theorem we can extract a subsequence h_n and a function $A \in L^2([0,T])$ such that $|Dsp^{h_n}| \rightharpoonup A$ weakly in $L^2([0,T])$. For fixed t^* and $s < t$ we deduce from the log-Lipschitz property (12)

$$\begin{aligned} d_{t^*}(\bar{x}^h_t, \bar{x}^h_s) &\leq \int_{\underline{h}(s)}^{\overline{h}(t)} \frac{1}{h} d_{t^*}(\bar{x}^h_r, \bar{x}^h_{r-h}) dr \\ &\leq \int_{\underline{h}(s)}^{\overline{h}(t)} \frac{1}{h} d_{\overline{h}(r)}(\bar{x}^h_r, \bar{x}^h_{r-h}) e^{L|\overline{h}(r) - t^*|} dr, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} d_{t^*}(\bar{x}^{h_n}_t, \bar{x}^{h_n}_s) \leq \int_t^s A(r) e^{L|r-t^*|} dr.$$

Propostion 3.3.1 in [2] and (38) imply that there exists a further subsequence, not relabeled, and a limit curve $x : [0,T] \to X$ such that

$$\bar{x}^{h_n}_t \overset{\sigma}{\rightharpoonup} x_t, \quad \tilde{x}^{h_n}_t \overset{\sigma}{\rightharpoonup} x_t \quad \forall t \in [0,T].$$

This curve is absolutely continuous since

$$d_{t^*}(x_t, x_s) \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} d_{t^*}(\bar{x}^{h_n}_t, \bar{x}^{h_n}_s) \leq \int_s^t A(r) e^{L|r-t^*|} dr,$$

In particular if we take $t^* = t$ in the argumentation above the Lebesgue differentiation theorem implies that

$$|\dot{x}|_t \leq \limsup_{s \nearrow t} \frac{1}{t-s} \int_s^t A(r) e^{L|r-t|} dr \leq A(t)$$

holds true for almost every t.

□

Proposition 3.19. *Suppose additionally to our standing assumptions **A1**, **A2**, **A3b**, **A4** and **A5** that*

- *If $x_n \xrightarrow{\sigma} x$ as $n \to \infty$ then*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \partial_t E_t(x_n) \leq \partial_t E_t(x), \tag{39}$$

- *if $t_n \to t$ and $x_n \xrightarrow{\sigma} x$, then*

$$|\nabla_t E_t|^2(x) \leq \liminf |\nabla_{t_n} E_t|^2(x_n).$$

Then every limit curve x_t from Proposition 3.18 satisfies the EDI formula

$$E_t(x_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{x}|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r E_r|^2(x_r) dr \leq E_0(\bar{x}) + \int_0^t (\partial_r E_r)(x_r) dr, \tag{40}$$

for every $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof. Recall that Proposition 3.15 states for $s = 0$

$$E_{\overline{h_n}(t)}(\bar{x}_t^{h_n}) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (Dsp_r^{h_n})^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr = E_0(\bar{x}) + \int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}_r^{h_n}) dr.$$

Since both $\bar{x}_t^{h_n}$, $\tilde{x}_t^{h_n}$ σ-converges to x_t for every t, $x \mapsto E_t(x)$ and $x \mapsto \partial_t E_t(x)$ is σ-lower semicontinuous and $t \to E_t(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous uniformly in x, we know

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} E_{\overline{h_n}(t)}(\bar{x}_t^{h_n}) \geq E_t(x_t),$$

and

$$\int_0^t (\partial_r E_r)(x_r) dr \geq \int_0^t \limsup (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}_r^{h_n}) dr \geq \liminf \int_0^t (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}_r^{h_n}) dr,$$

where the last inequality follows from Fatou's Lemma. From Proposition 3.18 and Lemma 3.10 we deduce

$$\int_0^t |\dot{x}|_r^2 dr \leq \int_0^t A(r)^2 dr \leq \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_0^t (Dsp_r^{h_n})^2 dr,$$

and

$$\int_0^t |\nabla_r E_r|^2(x_r) dr \leq \liminf \int_0^t |\nabla_{\overline{h_n}(r)} E_r|^2(\tilde{x}_r^{h_n}) dr \leq \liminf \int_0^t (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr$$

Combining these inequalities with (34) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_t(x_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{x}|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r E_r|^2(x_r) dr \\
\leq &\liminf \left[E_{\overline{h_n}(t)}(\bar{x}_t^{h_n}) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (Dsp_r^{h_n})^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr \right] \\
\leq &\liminf \left[E_0(\bar{x}) + \int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (\partial_r E_r)(\tilde{x}_r^{h_n}) dr \right] \\
\leq &E_0(\bar{x}) + \int_0^t (\partial_r E_r)(x_r) dr,
\end{aligned}$$

which is the assertion.

□

4 Dynamic gradient flow of the entropy

In this section we want to study gradient flows for the Boltzmann entropy on probability space, where the metric of the space and the reference measure of the entropy varies in time. To show existence we apply the results from Section 3.2. We then go on to show also uniqueness.

Let X be a Polish space equipped with a Borel probability measure m and a family of complete separable geodesic metrics $(d_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$. We define $\mathcal{P}(X)$ to be the space of Borel probability measures on X and we denote the subspace of probability measures absolutely continuous to the measure m by $\mathcal{P}^{ac}(X)$. Further let $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$ be the space of probability measures with bounded second moments on X

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_2(X) := \Big\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(X) \Big| \int d^2(x, x_0) d\mu(x) < \infty \\
\text{for some, and thus any, } x_0 \in X, t \in [0,T] \Big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We say that a sequence $\mu_n \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$ converges weakly to μ if $\lim \int_X f d\mu_n = \int_X f d\mu$ for every continuous bounded function $f \in \mathcal{C}_b^0(X)$. We say that a sequence $\rho_n \subset L^1(X,m)$ converges weakly to ρ if $\lim \int_X f\rho_n dm = \int_X f\rho dm$ for every bounded function $f \in L^\infty(X,m)$. Note that if ρ_n converges weakly to ρ in $L^1(X,m)$ then $\mu_n = \rho_n m$ converges weakly to $\mu = \rho m$ in $\mathcal{P}(X)$.

4.1 Time-dependent Kantorovich metrics

For every metric d_t we define the L^2-Kantorovich distance W_t on the space $\mathcal{P}_2(X)$:

$$W_t(\mu,\nu) = \inf\{C_t(\gamma) : \pi^1_\# \gamma = \mu, \pi^2_\# \gamma = \nu\}^{1/2},$$

where $C_t(\gamma)$ is the cost of the plan $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X)$

$$C_t(\gamma) = \int d_t^2(x,y) d\gamma(x,y),$$

and $\pi^i_\# \gamma$ denote the first and second marginals of γ.

For each $t \in [0,T]$, $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_t)$ is a geodesic Polish space, see e.g. [23, 1]. It is well-known that convergence in the L^2-Kantorovich distance W_t implies weak convergence in $\mathcal{P}(X)$ and that W_t is lower semicontinuous on $\mathcal{P}(X)$ (cf. [23, Theorem 6.8] and [23, Remark 6.10]). The bound (12) is equivalent to

$$|\log W_t(\mu,\nu)/W_s(\mu,\nu)| \leq L|t-s|, \tag{41}$$

for all s,t and all probability measures on X, see Lemma 2.1 in [21]. In the sequel we shall always assume and (41).

The convexity of the squared metric speed is crucial for showing uniqueness of the gradient flow. More precisely we have the following result [10, Lemma 14].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(\mu^1_t), (\mu^2_t) \in \mathrm{AC}^2([0,T];\mathcal{P}(X))$ be two absolutely continuous curves. Define $\mu^{1,2}_t = (\mu^1_t + \mu^2_t)/2$. Then $(\mu^{1,2}_t)$ is absolutely continuous and the following bound on its metric derivative holds*

$$|\dot\mu^{1,2}|^2_t \leq \frac{|\dot\mu^1|^2_t + |\dot\mu^2|^2_t}{2}.$$

Proof. Fix $s,t \in [0,T]$. Pick optimal plans γ^1, γ^2, which minimize $W_t(\mu^1_t, \mu^1_s)$ and $W_t(\mu^2_t, \mu^2_s)$ respectively. Then the plan $\gamma^1 + \gamma^2/2$ has marginals $\mu^{1,2}_t$ and $\mu^{1,2}_s$ and therefore it holds

$$\begin{aligned} W^2_t(\mu^{1,2}_t, \mu^{1,2}_s) &\leq \int d^2_t(x,y)\, d\frac{\gamma^1+\gamma^2}{2}(x,y) \\ = \frac{1}{2}\int d^2_t(x,y)\, d\gamma^1(x,y) &+ \frac{1}{2}\int d^2_t(x,y)\, d\gamma^2(x,y) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}W^2_t(\mu^1_t,\mu^1_s) + \frac{1}{2}W^2_t(\mu^2_t,\mu^2_s). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the curve $(\mu^{1,2}_t)$ is absolutely continuous. Dividing by $(s-t)^2$ and taking the superior limit as s goes to t we get for its speed

$$|\dot\mu^{1,2}|^2_t \leq \frac{|\dot\mu^1|^2_t + |\dot\mu^2|^2_t}{2}.$$

□

4.2 Time-dependent Boltzmann entropy

We consider a family of measures $(m_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ on X. We suppose that for every $t \in [0,T]$ there exists a function $f_t \in L^\infty(X,m)$ such that $m_t = e^{-f_t}m$. Moreover let us always assume that there exists a constant L^* such that

$$|f_t(x) - f_s(x)| \leq L^*|t-s| \tag{42}$$

for all s,t and all x.

We denote by S_t the relative Boltzmann entropy with respect to m_t,

$$\begin{aligned} S\colon [0,T]\times\mathcal{P}_2(X) &\to [-\infty,\infty], \\ (t,\mu) \mapsto S_t(\mu) &= \mathrm{Ent}(\mu|m_t) = \int \rho\log\rho\, dm_t, \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho = d\mu / dm_t$ provided that $\mu \ll m_t$. Otherwise we set $S_t(\mu) = \infty$. It follows directly from the representation of the measures m_t that

$$S_t(\mu) = \mathrm{Ent}(\mu) + \int f_t(x) d\mu(x),$$

where $\mathrm{Ent}(\mu) = \mathrm{Ent}(\mu|m)$.

In the next lemma we list the crucial properties of the relative entropy functional.

Lemma 4.2. *The entropy $S\colon [0,T]\times\mathcal{P}_2(X) \to [-\infty,\infty]$ satisfies **A1**, **A2**, **A3b** and **A4**, i.e.*

1. *The domain $Dom(S_t)$ is time-independent.*
2. *$S_t(\mu)$ is uniformly bounded from below.*
3. *For each $t \in [0,T]$, $\mu \mapsto S_t(\mu)$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to weak convergence over probabilty space.*
4. *For every $\mu \in Dom(S)$ the map $t \mapsto S_t(\mu)$ is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant L^* and for the derivative it holds*

$$\partial_t S_t(\mu) = \int_X \partial_t f_t(x) d\mu(x) \text{ for a.e. } t \in [0,T].$$

Moreover the set of differentiability points of $t \mapsto S_t(\mu)$ can be chosen independ of μ.

Proof. The domain is time-independent by virtue of (42). Since $m(x) = 1$ we can estimate $\mathrm{Ent}(\mu) \geq 0$ and hence for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}^{ac}(X)$

$$S_t(\mu) \geq \int f_t(x) d\mu(x) \geq -||f_t||_{L^\infty} \geq -||f_s||_{L^\infty} - L^* T.$$

If $\mu \notin \mathcal{P}^{ac}(X)$ we know that $S_t(\mu) = \infty$ and we conclude $\inf_{t,\mu} S_t(\mu) > -\infty$.

For every t the measure $m_t(X)$ is finite and thus $\mu \to S_t(\mu)$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to weak convergence (Lemma 4.1 in [20]).

Fix $\mu \in Dom(S)$. The Lipschitz continuity of $t \mapsto f_t(x)$ ensures $|\partial_t S_t(\mu)| \leq C$. It is clear that for every $x \in X$ the map $t \mapsto f_t(x)$ is differentiable for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$. Hence the integral $\int_X \int_{t_1}^{t_2} |\partial_t f_t(x)| dt d\mu(x)$ exists and the Fubini-Tonelli theorem states

$$\int_X \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \partial_t f_t(x) dt d\mu(x) = \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_X \partial_t f_t(x) d\mu(x) dt.$$

The Fubini theorem again yields that for a.e. t the map $x \mapsto \partial_t f_t(x)$ is μ-integrable and so for a.e. t the integral

$$\int_X \partial_t f_t(x) d\mu(x)$$

exists. Take a differentiability point t of $f_t(x)$. Then for μ-a.e. $x \in X$

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h}(f_{t+h} - f_t)(x) = \partial_t f_t(x), \text{ and } \frac{1}{h}|(f_{t+h} - f_t)(x)| \leq L^*.$$

Hence we conclude that for a.e. $t \in [0,T]$

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h}[S_{t+h}(\mu)-S_t(\mu)] = \lim_{h\to 0}\int \frac{1}{h}[f_{t+h}(x)-f_t(x)]d\mu(x) = \int \partial_t f_t(x) d\mu(x),$$

where the last equality is due to the dominated convergence theorem. Finally, for $\mu \ll m$, the inclusions

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{t\in[0,T]\Big|\lim\frac{1}{h}[S_{t+h}(\mu)-S_t(\mu)] \text{ exists}\right\}\\ \subset&\left\{t\in[0,T]\Big|\lim\frac{1}{h}[f_{t+h}(x)-f_t(x)] \text{ exists for } \mu \text{ a.e. } x\right\}\\ \subset&\left\{t\in[0,T]\Big|\lim\frac{1}{h}[f_{t+h}(x)-f_t(x)] \text{ exists for } m \text{ a.e. } x\right\}\end{aligned}$$

show that the set of differentiability points of $t \mapsto S_t(\mu)$ does not depend on μ, since the complement $\left\{t\in[0,T]\Big|\lim\frac{1}{h}[f_{t+h}(x)-f_t(x)] \text{ exists for } m \text{ a.e. } x\right\}^C$ is negligible. □

Since we want to apply the results from Section 3.2, we still need to check the assumptions in Proposition 3.19. To show the lower semicontinuity of the squared slope, it is essential to assume that the entropy is K-convex for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. we have a uniform bound on the Ricci curvature of (X, d_t, m_t). We briefly recall the arguments in [10].

Definition 4.3. *The set $GP \subset \mathcal{P}(X^2)$ is the set of plans γ such that*

1. *the marginals $\pi^i_\# \gamma$, $i = 1, 2$ are absolutely continuous with densities bounded away from 0 and ∞,*
2. $\sup_{(x,y)\in supp(\gamma)} d_t(x,y) < \infty$ *for some $t \in [0,T]$, and thus for any.*

Given $\gamma \in GP$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2^{ac}(X)$, we define the plan $\gamma_\mu \in \mathcal{P}(X^2)$ and the measure $\nu_{\gamma,\mu} \in (X)$ as

$$d\gamma_\mu(x,y) = \frac{d\mu(x)}{d\pi^1_\#\gamma(x)} d\gamma(x,y), \quad \nu_{\gamma,\mu} = \pi^2_\#\gamma_\mu.$$

Note that since $\gamma_\mu \ll \gamma$, we have $\nu_{\gamma,\mu} \ll m$ with density

$$g_{\gamma,\mu}(y) = \frac{d\pi^2_\#\gamma(y)}{dm(y)} \int \frac{d\mu(x)}{d\pi^1_\#\gamma(x)} d\gamma_y(x),$$

where $(\gamma_y)_y \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$ is the disintegration of γ with respect to its second marginal.

Observe that from 2. of the definition of the set GP we have that the cost $C_t(\gamma)$ of a plan $\gamma \in GP$ is always finite and $\nu_{\gamma,\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ since $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X)$.

The next Proposition gives an alternative representation formula for the slope in terms of good plans, cf. [10, Theorem 12].

Proposition 4.4. *For every $t \in [0,T]$ and every $\mu \in Dom(S)$ it holds*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\substack{\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2(X) \\ \nu \neq \mu}} \frac{(S_t(\mu) - S_t(\nu) - \frac{K^-}{2} W_t^2(\mu,\nu))^+}{W_t(\mu,\nu)} \\ &= \sup_{\gamma \in GP} \frac{(S_t(\mu) - S_t(\nu_{\gamma,\mu}) - \frac{K^-}{2} C_t(\gamma_\mu))^+}{\sqrt{C_t(\gamma_\mu)}}, \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

where the value of the second expression is taken by definition as 0 if $C_t(\gamma_\mu) = 0$.

Proof. We start with proving $\geq$. For this fix a plan $\gamma \in GP$ such that $\nu_{\gamma,\mu} \neq \mu$. From $C_t(\gamma_\mu) \geq W_t^2(\mu, \nu_{\gamma,\mu}) > 0$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(S_t(\mu) - S_t(\nu_{\gamma,\mu}) - \frac{K^-}{2} W_t^2(\mu,\nu_{\gamma,\mu}))^+}{W_t(\mu,\nu_{\gamma,\mu})} \\ &\geq \frac{(S_t(\mu) - S_t(\nu_{\gamma,\mu}) - \frac{K^-}{2} C_t(\gamma_\mu))^+}{\sqrt{C_t(\gamma_\mu)}}. \end{aligned}$$

To show the reverse inequality take $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_2^{ac}(X)$ different from μ. Lemma 10 in [10] provides a sequence $(\gamma^n) \subset GP$ such that $S_t(\nu_{\gamma^n,\mu}) \to S_t(\nu)$ and $C_t(\gamma_\mu^n) \to W_t^2(\mu,\nu)$ as $n \to \infty$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(S_t(\mu) - S_t(\nu) - \frac{C}{2} W_t^2(\mu,\nu))^+}{W_t(\mu,\nu)} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{(S_t(\mu) - S_t(\nu_{\gamma^n,\mu}) - \frac{C}{2} C_t(\gamma_\mu^n))^+}{\sqrt{C_t(\gamma_\mu^n)}}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows $\leq$.

□

We get the following as consequence of formula (43), cf. [10, Corollary 13].

Corollary 4.5. *Suppose that S is K-convex. Then for every $t \in [0,T]$*

$$|\nabla_t S_t|^2(\mu) \leq \liminf |\nabla_t S_t|^2(\mu_n),$$

whenever $\mu_n \rightharpoonup \mu$ as $n \to \infty$ such that $\sup_n S_t(\mu_n) < \infty$. Further $\mu \mapsto |\nabla_t S_t|^2$ is convex with respect to linear interpolation on the sublevels of S.

Proof. Consider the map $\mu \mapsto C_t(\gamma_\mu)$. It is clearly linear. Also, one can show that it is weakly continuous on sublevels of the entropy. From [10, Proposition 11] we further know that $\mu \mapsto S_t(\mu) - S_t(\nu_{\gamma,\mu})$ is lower semicontinuous with respect to weak convergence on sublevels of the entropy and convex with respect to linear interpolation. Hence

$$\mu \mapsto S_t(\mu) - S_t(\nu_{\gamma,\nu}) - \frac{K^-}{2} C_t(\gamma_\mu)$$

is lower semicontinuous with respect to weak convergence on the sublevels of the entropy. The same holds true for its positive part. Now apply that the function

$\Psi\colon \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\Psi(a,b) = \begin{cases} \frac{a^2}{b} & \text{if } b > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } a = b = 0, \\ +\infty & \text{if } a \neq 0, b = 0 \text{ or } b < 0, \end{cases}$$

is convex, continuous on $[0,\infty)^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ and increasing in a, and the conclusion follows. From formula (43) the assertion follows.

□

4.3 Existence and Uniqueness of EDE-gradient flow for the entropy

In this section we want to show existence and uniqueness of the dynamic EDI-gradient flow with respect to the functional S on the complete geodesic space $(\mathcal{P}_2(X), W_t)$. For this we additionally have to assume that X is boundedly compact, i.e. closed balls are compact. For this reason we can take **A5** for granted, as shown in the next lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *Assume that X is boundedly compact. Then the following holds true. If $(\mu_n) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ with $\sup_{n,m} W_t(\mu_n, \mu_m) < \infty$, then $(\mu_n)_n$ is sequentially precompact with respect to weak convergence.*

Proof. If $\sup_{n,m} d_t(\mu_n, \mu_m) < \infty$ for a sequence $(\mu_n) \subset \mathcal{P}_2(X)$ the second moments are uniformly bounded. Then Lemma 16 in [10] implies that (μ_n) is tight. Applying Prokhorov's theorem we infer that (μ_n) is weakly sequentially precompact.

□

Theorem 4.7. *Assume additionally that X is boundedly compact. Suppose that S is K-convex for some $K \in \mathbb{R}$. Then for every $\bar{\mu} \in Dom(S)$ there exists a curve $(\mu_t) \in \mathrm{AC}^2([0,T], \mathcal{P}_2(X))$ starting in $\bar{\mu}$ and satisfying*

$$S_t(\mu_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}_r|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r) dr \leq S_0(\mu_0) + \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\mu_r) dr, \quad (44)$$

for every $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof. We may apply Proposition 3.18 and obtain a limit curve $\mu \in \mathrm{AC}^2([0,T]; \mathcal{P}_2(X))$ starting in $\bar{\mu}$ such that

$$\bar{\mu}_t^{h_n} \rightharpoonup \mu_t, \text{ and } \tilde{\mu}_t^{h_n} \rightharpoonup \mu_t \quad \forall t \in [0,T],$$

where $\bar{\mu}^h$ and $\tilde{\mu}^h$ are defined as in Definition 3.14. and satisfy by Proposition 3.15

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\overline{h_n}(t)}(\bar{\mu}_t^{h_n}) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (Dsp_r^{h_n})^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr \\ = S_0(\bar{\mu}) + \int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (\partial_r S_r)(\tilde{\mu}_r^{h_n}) dr. \end{aligned}$$

From Corollary 4.5, Lemma 3.10 and Lemma 3.4 together with (12), applying Fatou's Lemma we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r)dr \le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\tilde{\mu}_r^{h_n})dr \\
&\le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_0^t (|\nabla_{\overline{h_n}(r)} S_r|(\tilde{\mu}_r^{h_n}) + |\nabla_r S_r|(\tilde{\mu}_r^{h_n}) - |\nabla_{\overline{h_n}(r)} S_r|(\tilde{\mu}_r^{h_n}))^2 dr \\
&\le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \left[\int_0^t (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr + 2Ch_n \int (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr + Ch_n^2 \int (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We deduce

$$\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r)dr \le \liminf \int_0^t (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr$$

from the estimate $\int_0^t (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr \le S_0(\mu) + L^*T - \inf_{t,\mu} S_t(\mu)$

To show that (44) is valid, it is left to show that

$$\lim \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\tilde{\mu}_r^{h_n})dr = \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\mu_r).$$

This already follows if we prove that a stronger convergence than weak convergence of measures holds true. In fact, from (36) and we know that there exists a density $\tilde{\rho}_t^{h_n} = d\tilde{\mu}_t^{h_n}/dm \in L^1(X,m)$ for every $t \in [0,T]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The lower semicontinuity of the entropy implies that $\sup_t S_t(\mu_t) < \infty$ and thus $\mu_t = \rho_t m$, for some $\rho_t \in L^1(X,m)$. Choose an arbitrary subsequence h_{n_k}. Then since the family of densities $(\tilde{\rho}_t^{h_{n_k}})_k$ is equiintegrable, i.e.

$$\sup_k \int_X \max\{0, \rho_t^{h_{n_k}} \log \rho_t^{h_{n_k}}\} dm < \infty,$$

(cf. [6, Theorem 4.5.9]), the Dunford-Pettis Theorem ([6, Corollary 4.7.19]) ensures that there exists a subsubsequence $\tilde{\rho}_t^{h_{n_{k_l}}}$ that converges in the weak topology of $L^1(X,m)$ to the function $\rho_t \in L^1(X,m)$. Hence for the original subsequence we already have

$$\tilde{\rho}_t^{h_n} \rightharpoonup \rho_t \text{ in } L^1(X,m) \quad \forall t \in [0,T].$$

As a direct consequence we obtain (44), since similar as in Proposition 3.19

$$\begin{aligned}
&S_t(\mu_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r)dr \\
&\le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \left[S_{\overline{h_n}(t)}(\bar{\mu}_t^{h_n}) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (Dsp_r^{h_n})^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (Dsl_r^{h_n})^2 dr \right] \\
&\le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \left[S_0(\bar{\mu}) + \int_0^{\overline{h_n}(t)} (\partial_r S_r)(\tilde{\mu}_r^{h_n})dr \right] \\
&\le S_0(\bar{\mu}) + \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\mu_r)dr.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4.8. *Actually, the statement of Theorem 4.7 holds true without assuming that X is boundedly compact, since m is assumed to be finite. If (X,d) is a Polish space and $m \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ we may apply $z\log z \geq -1/e$ and Jensen's inequality to obtain*

$$\mathrm{Ent}_m(\mu) \geq \mu(E)\log\left(\frac{\mu(E)}{m(E)}\right) - \frac{1}{e} \quad \forall E \in \mathcal{B}(X).$$

*Taking into account that the singleton $\{m\}$ is tight, this shows tightness of the sublevels of the entropy since $\mu(E) \to 0$ as $m(E) \to 0$. Hence we could replace our assumption **A5** in section 3.2 by assuming that for each $t \in [0,T]$ the sublevels of the functional are sequentially σ-compact. See also [3, Remark 7.3].*

Theorem 4.9. *Assume S is K-convex and $\bar{\mu} \in Dom(S)$. Then there exists at most one dynamic EDI-gradient flow. Moreover we have equality in (44), i.e. for every $t \in [0,T]$ it holds the following dynamic EDE*

$$S_t(\mu_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}_r|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r)dr = S_0(\mu_0) + \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\mu_r)dr.$$

Proof. Let us first observe that a weak chain rule for gradient flows is applicable. For this we prove that a variant of the assumption in Proposition 3.7 concerning the time derivative is satisfied by the entropy S_t. We choose a sequence $\mu_n = \rho_n m$ converging to $\mu = \rho m$ such that $\sup_n S(\mu_n) < \infty$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.7 the sequence (ρ_n) is equi-integrable and thus ρ_n converges to ρ in duality with L^∞ functions. This implies that for almost every t

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{S_{t_n}(\mu_n) - S_t(\mu_n)}{t_n - t} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_X \frac{f_{t_n}(x) - f_t(x)}{t_n - t}\rho_n(x)dm(x) = \partial_t S_t(\mu), \quad (45)$$

if $t_n \searrow t$ as $n \to \infty$. This proves the weak chain rule (22) in Proposition 3.7 restricted to curves which are contained in the sublevels of the functional.

Let us assume that there exist two dynamic EDI-gradient flows (μ_t^1), (μ_t^2) starting from $\bar{\mu} \in Dom(S)$. As seen in the proof of Theorem 4.7 we know that these curves are contained in the sublevels of S and hence together with the weak chain rule it follows

$$S_0(\bar{\mu}) = S_t(\mu_t^1) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}^1|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r^1)dr - \int_0^t \partial_r S_r(\mu_r^1)dr,$$

$$S_0(\bar{\mu}) = S_t(\mu_t^2) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}^2|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r^2)dr - \int_0^t \partial_r S_r(\mu_r^2)dr.$$

Now define

$$\mu_t^{1,2} = \frac{\mu_t^1 + \mu_t^2}{2} \quad t \geq 0.$$

Then $\mu_0^{1,2} = \bar{\mu}$ and from the strict convexity of the entropy, the convexity of the squared slope (Corollary 4.5) and the convexity of the squared speed (Lemma 4.1) we have that

$$S_0(\bar{\mu}) > S_t(\mu_t^{1,2}) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}^{1,2}|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r^{1,2})dr - \int_0^t \partial_r S_r(\mu_r^{1,2})dr,$$

whenever these curves are different. But since (45) is applicable to $\mu_t^{1,2}$, this contradicts (22). □

5 Dynamic gradient flows in Hilbert spaces

Let H be a separable Hilbert space with a family of scalar products $(\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_t)$. We assume that (12) holds for the distances $||x-y||_t := \sqrt{\langle x-y, x-y\rangle_t}$. Let $E_t\colon H \to \mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$ a functional such that $x \mapsto E_t(x)$ is convex and lower semicontinuous. Again we require that the domain $Dom(E_t) = \{x\colon E_t(x) < \infty\}$ is time independent. The subdifferential $D_t^- E_t(x)$ of E_t at some $x \in Dom(E)$ is the set of all $v \in H$ such that

$$E_t(y) - E_t(x) \geq \langle v, y-x\rangle_t \qquad \forall y \in H.$$

It follows from the definition of the subdifferential that $D_t^- E_t$ is *monotone*, i.e. for every $v \in D_t^- E_t(x)$, $w \in D_t^- E_t(y)$ we have

$$\langle v-w, x-y\rangle_t \geq 0. \tag{46}$$

Note that $D_t^- E_t(x)$ is closed and convex. Hence we can set $\nabla_t E_t(x)$ as the element of minimal norm in $D_t^- E_t(x)$ as soon as $D_t^- E_t(x) \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 5.1. *We say that (x_t) is a* dynamic gradient flow *for E_t starting from $x \in H$ if it is locally absolutely continuous and*

$$\dot{x}_t \in -D_t^- E_t(x_t) \text{ for a.e. } t > 0$$

and $\lim_{t\searrow 0} x_t = x$.

We cannot hope to have a minimal selection result, i.e. $\frac{d^+}{dt}x_t = -\nabla E(x_t)$. We illustrate this in the following example.

Example 4. *Consider once again the energy functional $E_t(x) = |x-t|$. Then the curve $x_t = t$ defines a gradient flow of E_t since $\dot{x}_t = 1 \in -D_t^- E_t(x_t)$, but $\dot{x}_t \neq -\nabla_t E(x_t) = 0$.*

In the following we show that the gradient flow from Definition 5.1 satisfies the *dynamic evolution variation inequality* introduced in [13]. For $s,t \in [0,T]$, $\gamma \in \mathrm{AC}^2([0,1];H)$ we set

$$\mathcal{A}_{s,t}(\gamma) := \limsup_{h\to 0}\Big\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}(a_i - a_{i-1})^{-1}||\gamma_{a_i} - \gamma_{a_{i-1}}||^2_{s+a(t-s)}\Big\}$$

where the supremum runs over all partitions $0 = a_0 < a_1 < \cdots a_n = 1$ such that $a_i - a_{i-1} \leq h$ for some $h > 0$. For $x, y \in H$ we define

$$||x-y||^2_{s,t} := \inf A_{s,t}(\gamma),$$

where the infimum runs over all curves $\gamma \in \mathrm{AC}^2([0,1];H)$ such that $\gamma_0 = x$ and $\gamma_1 = y$. It is important to note that $||x-y||_{s,t} \neq ||y-x||_{s,t}$ unless $x = y$ or $s = t$. But it holds $||x-y||_{s,t} = ||y-x||_{t,s}$.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $E\colon [0,T]\times H \to (-\infty,+\infty]$ be a convex and lower semicontinuous functional. Let $(x_t)_t$ be a gradient flow of E_t in the sense of Definition 5.1. Then (x_t) is a dynamic forward EVI$(-L/2,\infty)$ gradient flow, i.e. for all $y \in Dom(E)$ and a.e. t*

$$-\partial_s^- ||x_s - y||^2_{s,t}\Big|_{s=t} + \frac{L}{4}||x_t - y||^2_t \geq E_t(x_t) - E_t(y).$$

Proof. Let $y \in Dom(E)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\partial_s^+ ||x_s - y||_{s,t}^2\Big|_{s=t} &= \limsup_{s\to t}\left\{\frac{1}{2(s-t)}(||x_s - y||_{s,t}^2 - ||x_t - y||_t^2)\right\}\\ &\le \limsup_{s\to t}\left\{\frac{1}{2(s-t)}(||x_s - y||_{s,t}^2 - ||x_s - y||_t^2)\right\}\\ &+ \limsup_{s\to t}\left\{\frac{1}{2(s-t)}(||x_s - y||_t^2 - ||x_t - y||_t^2)\right\}\end{aligned}$$

The first limsup can be estimated with the help of Proposition 7.2(iii) in [13] by

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{s\to t}\left\{\frac{1}{2(s-t)}(||x_s - y||_{s,t}^2 - ||x_s - y||_t^2)\right\}\\ \le &\limsup_{s\to t}\left\{\frac{1}{2(s-t)}\Big(\frac{e^{L|t-s|}-1}{L|t-s|} - 1\Big)||x_s - y||_s^2\right\}\\ = &\limsup_{s\to t}\left\{\frac{1}{2(s-t)}\Big(\frac{\frac{1}{2}L|t-s|^2 + o(|t-s|^2)}{L|t-s|}\Big)||x_s - y||_s^2\right\}\\ \le &\frac{L}{4}||x_t - y||_t^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the continuity of $t \mapsto x_t$ and $t \mapsto ||\cdot||_t$. For the second limsup we apply that (x_t) is supposed to be a gradient flow of E;

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{s\to t}\left\{\frac{1}{2(s-t)}(||x_s - y||_t^2 - ||x_t - y||_t^2)\right\}\\ =&\langle x_t - y, \dot{x}_t\rangle_t \le E_t(y) - E_t(x_t)\end{aligned}$$

for a.e. $t \ge 0$. Combining these two observations we conclude

$$\frac{1}{2}\partial_s^+ ||x_s - y||_{s,t}^2\Big|_{s=t} \le \frac{L}{4}||x_t - y||_t^2 + E_t(y) - E_t(x_t),$$

which was to show. □

5.1 Existence and Uniqueness

We assume that the following holds for the energy functional.

1. $x \mapsto E_t(x)$ is lower semicontinuous
   and $E_t(x) \ge 0 \quad \forall (t,x) \in [0,T] \times Dom(E)$,
2. $\exists\, C_1\, \forall x \in Dom(E)\, \forall s,t \in [0,T]: \quad |E_t(x) - E_s(x)| \le C_1 E_t(x)|t-s|$.

As a consequence we obtain that if $v_n \in D_t^- E_t(x_n)$ and $x_n \to x$, $v_n \rightharpoonup v$, then $v \in D_t^- E_t(x)$.

We write

$$e(x) := \sup_{t\in[0,T]} E_t(x).$$

Note that from the Lipschitz property it follows that there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that for all $x \in Dom(E)$

$$e(x) \le C_2 \inf_{t\in[0,T]} E_t(x). \tag{47}$$

Approximation

We fix a time step $h > 0$ and subdivide the interval $[0, T]$ into

$$\mathcal{P}_h := \{t_0 = 0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_{N-1} < T \leq t_N\}, \qquad t_n = nh, N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

For $0 \leq t \leq T$ we define the piecewise constant interpolants $\overline{h}(t)$ and $\underline{h}(t)$ associated with the partition $\mathcal{P}_h$ in the following way;

$$\overline{h}(0) = 0 = \underline{h}(0), \text{ and for } t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n] \quad \overline{h}(t) = t_n, \quad \underline{h}(t) = t_{n-1}. \tag{48}$$

The definition implies that $\overline{h}(t) \searrow t$ and $\underline{h}(t) \nearrow t$ if $h \searrow 0$.

For a given initial value $\bar{x}$ we recursively define a sequence (x_n^h) of minimizers by

$$x_0^h := \bar{x}, \qquad x_n^h := \arg\min_x \Big\{ E_{t_n}(x) + \frac{1}{2h} ||x - x_{n-1}^h||_{t_n}^2 \Big\}. \tag{49}$$

We can argue as in the proof of Proposition 3.8 and directly obtain for every $\bar{x} \in Dom(E)$ and $h > 0$ a (unique) solution to the minimization problem (49). As in section 3.2 we define piecewise constant interpolants by setting

$$\bar{x}_t^h := x_n^h \text{ for } t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n], \qquad \underline{x}_t^h := x_{n-1}^h \text{ for } t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n],$$

and moreover, the piecewise linear interpolant

$$x_t^h = \frac{t - t_{n-1}}{h} x_n^h + \frac{t_n - t}{h} x_{n-1}^h \text{ for } t \in [t_{n-1}, t_n).$$

For $t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n)$ we denote the time derivative of $t \mapsto x_t^h$ by $\dot{x}_t^h$.

Recall that the variational interpolation is a map $t \to \tilde{x}_t^h$ defined by

$$\tilde{x}_t^h = \arg\min_x \Big\{ E_t(x) + \frac{1}{2r} ||x - x_{n-1}^h||_{t_n}^2 \Big\}, \qquad \text{for } t = t_{n-1} + r \in (t_{n-1}, t_n],$$

and $\tilde{x}_0^h = \bar{x}$. Finally we define $t \mapsto \tilde{v}_t^h$ by

$$\tilde{v}_t^h := \frac{\tilde{x}_t^h - x_{n-1}^h}{t - t_{n-1}} \quad \forall t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n].$$

As in Section 3.2, in order to subtract a converging subsequence, we proof a priori estimates on the discrete solutions. The proof is along the lines of Proposition 6.3 in [18].

Proposition 5.3. *The following inequality holds for the interpolants $\bar{x}^h$, x^h, $\tilde{x}^h$ and $\tilde{v}^h$*

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\overline{h}(t)}(\bar{x}_t^h) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\overline{h}(s)}^{\overline{h}(t)} ||\dot{x}_r^h||_{\overline{h}(r)}^2 dr + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\overline{h}(s)}^{\overline{h}(t)} ||\tilde{v}_r^h||_{\overline{h}(r)}^2 dr \\ \leq E_{\overline{h}(s)}(\bar{x}_s^h) + C_1 \int_{\overline{h}(s)}^{\overline{h}(t)} e(\tilde{x}_r^h) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

In particular there exists a constant M such that for all $h > 0$

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T)} e(\bar{x}_t^h) \le M, \qquad \sum_{n=0}^{N} \frac{1}{h}||x_n^h - x_{n-1}^h||_{t_n}^2 \le M, \tag{51}$$

$$\int_0^T ||\dot{x}_r^h||_{h(r)}^2 dr \le M, \qquad \int_0^T ||\tilde{v}_r^h||_{h(r)}^2 dr \le M. \tag{52}$$

Moreover

$$||\tilde{x}_t^h - \underline{x}_t^h||^2 \in O(h), \quad ||x_t^h - \bar{x}_t^h||^2 \in O(h), \quad ||\bar{x}_t^h - \underline{x}_t^h||^2 \in O(h). \tag{53}$$

Proof. Consider the map

$$r \mapsto J_{s,r}(y) := \min_x \Big\{ E_{s+r}(x) + \frac{1}{2r}||x-y||_{s+h}^2 \Big\}$$

for a given $s \in [0,T]$, $y \in D$, $0 < r < T - s$. We claim that this map is differentiable almost everywhere in $(0, T-s)$ and for every $r_0 \in (0, T-s)$ for the minimizer $(0, r_0] \ni r \mapsto x_r$ it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2r_0}||x_{r_0} - y||_{s+h}^2 + \int_0^{r_0} \frac{1}{2r^2}||x_r - y||_{s+h}^2 dr + E_{s+r_0}(x_{r_0}) \\ \le E_s(y) + C_1 \int_0^{r_0} e(x_r) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Indeed, arguing similar as in (30) we obtain that for $r_1 < r_2 \in (0, T-s)$

$$\begin{aligned} &J_{s,r_2}(y) - J_{s,r_1}(y) - (E_{s+r_2}(x_{r_1}) - E_{s+r_1}(x_{r_1})) \\ &\le -\frac{1}{2r_1 r_2}(r_2 - r_1)||x_{r_1} - y||_{s+h}^2 \le 0, \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

hence the map $r \mapsto J_{s,r}(y)$ is the sum of locally Lipschitz and of a nonincreasing function

$$J_{s,r_2}(y) \le J_{s,r_1}(y) + (r_2 - r_1)C_1 e(x_{r_1}),$$

and differentiable almost everywhere. So let $r \in (0, T-s)$ be a differentiable point of $r \mapsto J_{s,r}(y)$. Then with (55) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dr}J_{s,r}(y) + \frac{1}{2r^2}||x_r - y||_{s+h}^2 \\ &= \lim_{h\to 0} \Big(\frac{J_{s,r+h}(y) - J_{s,r}(y)}{h} + \frac{1}{2(r+h)r}||x_r - y||_{s+h}^2 \Big) \\ &\le \liminf_{h\to 0} \frac{E_{s+r+h}(x_r) - E_{s+r}(x_r)}{h} \le C_1 e(x_r), \end{aligned}$$

and integrating from 0 to r_0 gives us (54).

Applying (54) with $t \in (t_{n-1}, t_n]$, $y = x_{n-1}^h$, $s = t_{n-1}$ and $r_0 = t - s$ we obtain for $\tilde{x}_t^h$

$$\frac{1}{2(t-t_{n-1})}||\tilde{x}_t^h - x_{n-1}^h||_{t_n}^2 + \int_{t_{n-1}}^t \frac{1}{2(r-t_{n-1})^2}||\tilde{x}_r^h - x_{n-1}^h||_{t_n}^2 dr + E_t(\tilde{x}_t^h) \tag{56}$$

$$\le E_{t_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}^h) + C_1 \int_{t_{n-1}}^t e(\tilde{x}_r^h) dr. \tag{57}$$

Inserting $t = t_n$ we get for the interpolants x_t^h, $\tilde{v}_t^h$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} ||\dot{x}_r^h||_{t_n}^2 dr + \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \frac{1}{2}||\tilde{v}_r^h||_{t_n}^2 dr + E_{t_n}(\tilde{x}_{t_n}^h) \\ &\leq E_{t_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}^h) + C_1 \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e(\tilde{x}_r^h) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Summing over the partition we end up with (50).

Note that the minimality and (47) imply that for $r \in (t_{n-1}, t_n]$, $t = t_{n-1} + r$

$$e(\bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h) \geq E_t(\bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h) \geq \frac{1}{2h}||\tilde{x}_r^h - \bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h||_{t_n}^2 + E_t(\tilde{x}_r^h) \geq E_t(\tilde{x}_r^h) \geq \frac{1}{C_2} e(\tilde{x}_r^h),$$

and hence with (58) we can estimate

$$E_{t_n}(\bar{x}_{t_n}^h) \leq E_{t_{n-1}}(x_{n-1}^h) + C_1 C_2 \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} e(\bar{x}_{t_{n-1}}^h) dr.$$

Summing over the partitions and applying (47) once more we obtain for some constant $C > 0$

$$e(\bar{x}_{t_n}^h) \leq C(E_0(x_0^h) + \int_0^{t_n} e(\underline{x}_r^h) dr).$$

We obtain the first inequality in (51) by applying a discrete Gronwall argument (see e.g. [19, Lemma 4.5]). It directly follows that the right-hand side of (50) is bounded and (52) holds. The second inequality in (51) is a direct consequence of the first estimate in (52).

In order to show the first statement in (53) recall that (56) together with (51) implies (with some different constant M)

$$||\tilde{x}_t^h - \underline{x}_t^h||^2 \leq 2hM.$$

The other two assertions in (53) follow from (52) since

$$||x_t^h - x_s^h|| \leq \int_s^t ||\dot{x}_r^h|| dr \leq \sqrt{M(t-s)} \qquad \forall 0 < s < t < T.$$

□

The following result provides the compactness of the approximate solutions.

Proposition 5.4. *For every vanishing sequence (h_j) of time-steps, there exists an absolutely continuous curve $(x_t) \subset \mathrm{AC}^2([0,T];H)$ and a subsequence (not relabeled) such that*

$$x_t^{h_j}, \bar{x}_t^{h_j}, \tilde{x}_t^{h_j} \to x_t \text{ in } \mathcal{C}^0([0,T];H),$$

and

$$\dot{x}_t^{h_j} \rightharpoonup \dot{x}_t \text{ in } L^2([0,T];H).$$

Proof. Let $0 < g \leq h$ be two stepsizes and $\{t_n^g\}_{n=0}^{N_g}$, $\{t_n^h\}_{n=0}^{N_h}$ the corresponding partitions of the interval $[0,1]$. Let $\{x_n^h\}_{n=0}^{N_h}$ and $\{x_n^g\}_{n=0}^{N_g}$ be the solution to the

minimizing problem (49) with respect to the stepsizes h and g respectively with initial condition x_0^h and x_0^g. The Euler-Lagrange equation of x_n^h is

$$\frac{x_n^h - x_{n-1}^h}{h} \in -D^-_{t_n^h} E_{t_n^h}(x_n^h),$$

i.e.

$$h^{-1}\langle x_n^h - x_{n-1}^h, x_n^h - y\rangle_{t_n^h} + E_{t_n^h}(x_n^h) - E_{t_n^h}(y) \leq 0 \quad \forall y \in H.$$

Inserting the definition of the piecewise linear interpolation x_t^h at $t \in (t_{n-1}^h, t_n^h)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \dot{x}_t^h, x_t^h - y\rangle_{t_n^h} + E_{t_n^h}(x_t^h) - E_{t_n^h}(y) \\ &\leq (t - t_n^h)\Big(||\dot{x}_t^h||^2_{t_n^h} + \frac{1}{h}(E_{t_n^h}(x_n^h) - E_{t_n^h}(x_{n-1}^h))\Big) \quad \forall y \in H, \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

where we applied the convexity of $x \mapsto E_t(x)$. The same argumentation for x_t^g at $t \in (t_{m-1}^g, t_m^g)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \dot{x}_t^g, x_t^g - y\rangle_{t_m^g} + E_{t_m^g}(x_t^g) - E_{t_n^g}(y) \\ &\leq (t - t_m^g)\Big(||\dot{x}_t^g||^2_{t_m^g} + \frac{1}{g}(E_{t_m^g}(x_m^g) - E_{t_m^g}(x_{m-1}^g))\Big) \quad \forall y \in H. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

For $t \in (t_{n-1}^h, t_n^h) \cap (t_{m-1}^g, t_m^g)$ we get by putting $y = x_t^g$ into (59) and $y = x_t^h$ into (60) and adding them

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \dot{x}_t^h, x_t^h - x_t^g\rangle_{t_n^h} + \langle \dot{x}_t^g, x_t^g - x_t^h\rangle_{t_m^g} \\ &+ E_{t_n^h}(x_t^h) - E_{t_n^g}(x_t^h) + E_{t_m^g}(x_t^g) - E_{t_n^h}(x_t^g) \\ &\leq (t - t_n^h)\Big(||\dot{x}_t^h||^2_{t_n^h} + \frac{E_{t_n^h}(x_n^h) - E_{t_n^h}(x_{n-1}^h)}{h}\Big) \\ &+ (t - t_m^g)\Big(||\dot{x}_t^g||^2_{t_m^g} + \frac{E_{t_m^g}(x_m^g) - E_{t_m^g}(x_{m-1}^g)}{g}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

The Lipschitz property (12) of the metric together with the polarization identity gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle \dot{x}_t^h, x_t^h - x_t^g\rangle_{t_n^h} + \langle \dot{x}_t^g, x_t^g - x_t^h\rangle_{t_m^g} \\ &\geq \langle \dot{x}_t^h - \dot{x}_t^g, x_t^h - x_t^g\rangle_{t_m^g} - L|t_n^h - t_m^g|\Big(\langle \dot{x}_t^h, x_t^h - x_t^g\rangle_{t_m^g} + \frac{1}{2}||\dot{x}_t^h - (x_t^h - x_t^g)||^2_{t_m^g}\Big), \end{aligned}$$

while the Lipschitz property of the energy yields

$$E_{t_n^h}(x_t^h) - E_{t_n^g}(x_t^h) + E_{t_m^g}(x_t^g) - E_{t_n^h}(x_t^g) \geq -C_1|t_n^h - t_m^g|\Big(E_{t_n^h}(x_t^h) + E_{t_n^h}(x_t^g)\Big).$$

Inserting these two inequalities into (61) we find

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}||x_t^h - x_t^g||^2_{t_m^g} = \langle \dot{x}_t^h - \dot{x}_t^g, x_t^h - x_t^g\rangle_{t_m^g} \\ &\leq (t - t_n^h)\Big(||\dot{x}_t^h||^2_{t_n^h} + \frac{E_{t_n^h}(x_n^h) - E_{t_n^h}(x_{n-1}^h)}{h}\Big) \\ &+ (t - t_m^g)\Big(||\dot{x}_t^g||^2_{t_m^g} + \frac{E_{t_m^g}(x_m^g) - E_{t_m^g}(x_{m-1}^g)}{g}\Big) \\ &+ L|t_n^h - t_m^g|\Big(\langle \dot{x}_t^h, x_t^h - x_t^g\rangle_{t_m^g} + \frac{1}{2}||\dot{x}_t^h - (x_t^h - x_t^g)||^2_{t_m^g}\Big) \\ &+ C_1|t_n^h - t_m^g|\Big(E_{t_n^h}(x_t^h) + E_{t_n^h}(x_t^g)\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Integrating (62) on the interval $(t^h_{n-1} \vee t^g_{m-1}, t)$ we can estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
&||x^h_t - x^g_t||^2_{t^g_m} - ||x^h_{t^h_{n-1}\vee t^g_{m-1}} - x^g_{t^h_{n-1}\vee t^g_{m-1}}||^2_{t^g_m} \\
&\leq h \int_{t^h_{n-1}\vee t^g_{m-1}}^{t} \Big(- ||\dot{x}^h_r||^2_{t^h_n} + \frac{E_{t^h_n}(x^h_{n-1}) - E_{t^h_n}(x^h_n)}{h} \Big)\, dr \\
&+ g \int_{t^h_{n-1}\vee t^g_{m-1}}^{t} \Big(- ||\dot{x}^g_r||^2_{t^g_m} + \frac{E_{t^g_m}(x^g_{m-1}) - E_{t^g_m}(x^g_m)}{g} \Big)\, dr \\
&+ L(h\wedge g) \int_{t^h_{n-1}\vee t^g_{m-1}}^{t} \Big(||\dot{x}^h_r||^2_{t^g_m}\, dr + ||x^h_r - x^g_r||^2_{t^g_m} \Big)\, dr \\
&+ C_1(h\wedge g) \int_{t^h_{n-1}\vee t^g_{m-1}}^{t} \Big(E_{t^h_n}(x^h_r) + E_{t^h_n}(x^g_r) \Big)\, dr.
\end{aligned}
\tag{63}
$$

Summing over the partition $\{t^{h,g}_j\}_{j=0}^{N_h+N_g} = \{t^h_n\}_{n=0}^{N_h} \cup \{t^g_m\}_{m=0}^{N_g}$ and exploiting the Lipschutz property of $t \mapsto ||\cdot||_t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
||x^h_t - x^g_t||^2_{t^g_m} \leq & ||x^h_0 - x^g_0||^2_0 + Lg \sum_{j=1}^{n+m} ||x^h_{t^{h,g}_{j-1}} - x^g_{t^{h,g}_{j-1}}||^2_{g(t^{h,g}_{j-1})} \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \int_{t^h_{j-1}}^{t^h_j} (-h||\dot{x}^h_r||^2_{t^h_j} + E_{t^h_j}(x^h_{j-1}) - E_{t^h_j}(x^h_j))\, dr \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int_{t^g_{j-1}}^{t^g_j} (-g||\dot{x}^g_r||^2_{t^g_j} + E_{t^g_j}(x^g_{j-1}) - E_{t^g_j}(x^g_j))\, dr \\
&+ L(h\wedge g) \int_0^t \Big(||\dot{x}^h_r||^2_{g(r)} dr + ||x^h_r - x^g_r||^2_{g(r)} \Big)\, dr \\
&+ C_1(h\wedge g) \int_0^t (E_{h(r)}(x^h_r) + E_{h(r)}(x^g_r))\, dr.
\end{aligned}
$$

Applying once more the Lipschitz property of $t \mapsto E_t(x)$, we can further estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
&||x^h_t - x^g_t||^2_{t^g_m} \leq ||x^h_0 - x^g_0||^2_0 + Lg \sum_{j=1}^{n+m} ||x^h_{t^{h,g}_{j-1}} - x^g_{t^{h,g}_{j-1}}||^2_{g(t^{h,g}_{j-1})} \\
&+ h(E_0(x^h_0) - E_{t^h_n}(x^h_n)) + g(E_0(x^g_0) - E_{t^g_m}(x^g_m)) \\
&+ L(h\wedge g) \int_0^t ||\dot{x}^h_r||^2_{h(r)} dr + C(h\wedge g) \int_0^t ||x^h_r - x^g_r||^2_{g(r)} dr \\
&+ C_1(h\wedge g) \int_0^t (E_{h(r)}(x^h_r) + E_{h(r)}(x^g_r)) dr \\
&+ C_1 \sum_j \int_{t^h_{j-1}}^{t^h_j} (t^h_j - t^h_{j-1}) E_{t^h_j}(x^h_{j-1}) dr + C_1 \sum_k \int_{t^g_{k-1}}^{t^g_k} (t^g_k - t^g_{k-1}) E_{t^g_k}(x^g_{k-1}) dr.
\end{aligned}
\tag{64}
$$

From the positivity of E and from (52) as well as (51) we can deduce (with

varying constants)

$$\begin{aligned}
||x_t^h - x_t^g||_{t_m^g}^2 \leq & ||x_0^h - x_0^g||_0^2 + Lg \sum_{j=1}^{n+m} ||x^h_{t^{h,g}_{j-1}} - x^g_{t^{h,g}_{j-1}}||^2_{g(t^{h,g}_{j-1})} \\
& + hE_0(x_0^h) + gE_0(x_0^g) \\
& + C(h \wedge g) + C(h \wedge g) \int_0^t ||x_r^h - x_r^g||^2_{g(r)} dr \\
& + C(h \wedge g) + Ch + Cg \\
\leq & ||x_0^h - x_0^g||_0^2 + Lg \sum_{j=1}^{n+m} ||x^h_{t^{h,g}_{j-1}} - x^g_{t^{h,g}_{j-1}}||^2_{g(t^{h,g}_{j-1})} \\
& + C(h+g) + C(h \wedge g).
\end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

The last inequality follows from

$$\sup_r ||x_r^h||_{t^*} = \sup_n ||x_n^h||_{t^*} \leq \sup_n (\sqrt{2CnhM} + ||x_0^h||_{t^*}) \leq \sqrt{2CTM} + ||x_0^h||_{t^*},$$

where we used the definition of $(x_r^h)_{r\in[0,T]}$ in the second equality, triangle inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality in the second, and C is the constant coming from the log Lipschitz control of the metric.

For g sufficiently small there exists a κ satisfying $1 - Cg \geq \frac{1}{\kappa} > 0$. Applying the discrete Gronwall lemma [19, Lemma 4.5] we finally obtain with $g \leq h$

$$||x_t^h - x_t^g||_{t_m^g}^2 \leq \kappa C(h+g)e^{\kappa(n+m)g} \leq \kappa C(h+g)e^{2T\kappa}. \tag{66}$$

This shows that if h_j is a vanishing sequence of stepsizes, $\{x^{h_j}\}_j \subset \mathcal{C}^0([0,T];H)$ is a Cauchy sequence. Since $\mathcal{C}^0([0,T];H)$ is a Banach space there exists a continuous curve $(x_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ and a subsequence (not relabeled) such that $x_t^{h_j} \to x_t$ in $\mathcal{C}^0([0,T];H)$ as $j \to \infty$. From (53) it follows immediately that also $\tilde{x}_t^{h_j}, \bar{x}_t^{h_j}$ converge to x_t.

Since $\int_0^T ||\dot{x}_r^{h_j}||^2 dr \leq M$ we can extract a further subsequence (not relabeled) with

$$\dot{x}^{h_j} \rightharpoonup u \text{ in } L^2([0,T];H)$$

where u is some function in $L^2([0,T];H)$. As a consequence we obtain that the limit function $x \in \mathrm{AC}^2([0,T];H)$ since for all $0 < s < t < T$

$$||x_t - x_s||_{t^*} = \lim_{j\to\infty} ||x_t^{h_j} - x_s^{h_j}||_{t^*} = \lim_{j\to\infty} ||\int_s^t \dot{x}_r^{h_j} dr||_{t^*} \leq \int_s^t ||u_r||_{t^*} dr, \tag{67}$$

where t^* is an arbitrarily fixed timepoint in $[0,T]$. We still have to show that $u_r = \dot{x}_r$ almost everywhere. This follows again straghtforward from the weak convergence of $\dot{x}^{h_j}$. Let $y \in H$, then

$$\langle x_t - x_s, y\rangle_{t^*} = \lim \langle x_t^{h_j} - x_s^{h_j}, y\rangle_{t^*} = \lim \langle \int_s^t \dot{x}_r^{h_j} dr, y\rangle_{t^*} = \langle \int_s^t u_r dr, y\rangle_{t^*}.$$

Since $y \in H$ is arbitrary we obtain

$$x_t - x_s = \int_s^t u_r dr,$$

and hence $\lim_{s\to t} \frac{x_t - x_s}{t-s} = u_t$ at every Lebesgue point of u.

□

Theorem 5.5. *Let E be as in the beginning of this section. Then for every $x \in Dom(E)$ there exists a unique map $t \mapsto x_t$ from $[0,T]$ to X with $\lim_{t\searrow 0} x_t = x$ such that*

$$\dot{x}_t \in -D_t^- E_t(x_t) \text{ for a.e. } t \in (0,T).$$

Proof. Recall that the minimizers of (49) with $x_0^h := x$ satisfy the Euler-Lagrange equation, that is in terms of the subdifferential of E, the piecewise linear interpolant x_t^h and the piecewise constant interpolant $\bar{x}_t^h$

$$\langle \dot{x}_t^h, \bar{x}_t^h - y\rangle_{t_n^h} + E_{t_n^h}(\bar{x}_t^h) - E_{t_n^h}(y) \le 0 \quad \forall y \in H, \text{ for every } t \in (t_{n-1}^h, t_n^h).$$

The log Lipschitz property together with the polarization identity gives then for all $y \in H$ and almost every $t \in [0,T]$

$$\langle \dot{x}_t^h, \bar{x}_t^h - y\rangle_t + E_t(\bar{x}_t^h) - E_t(y) \le Lh(||\dot{x}_t^h||_t^2 + ||\bar{x}_t^h - y||_t^2) + C_1 h(e(\bar{x}_t^h) + e(y)).$$

Integrating this inequality over the interval (s,t) for some $0 < s < t < T$ we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_s^t \langle \dot{x}_r^h, \bar{x}_r^h - y\rangle_r \, dr + \int_s^t E_r(\bar{x}_r^h) - E_r(y)\, dr \\ &\le Lh \int_s^t ||\dot{x}_r^h||^2 + ||\bar{x}_r^h - y||_r^2 \, dr + C_1 h \int_s^t (e(\bar{x}_r^h) + e(y)) dr. \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

Applying Proposition 5.4 we get existence of a subsequence and a curve $(x_t) \in \mathrm{AC}^2([0,T];H)$ such that $\bar{x}_t^h \to x_t$ in $\mathcal{C}^0([0,T];H)$ and $\dot{x}_t^h \to \dot{x}_t$ weakly in $L^2([0,T];H)$. Hence we get for all $y \in Dom(E)$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_s^t \langle \dot{x}_r, x_r - y\rangle_r dr + \int_s^t E_r(x_r) - E_r(y) dr \\ &\le \liminf_{h\to 0} \int_s^t \langle \dot{x}_r^h, \bar{x}_r^h - y\rangle_r dr + \liminf_{h\to 0} \int_s^t E_r(\bar{x}_r^h) - E_r(y) dr \\ &\le \liminf_{h\to 0} \Big\{ \int_s^t \langle \dot{x}_r^h, \bar{x}_r^h - y\rangle_r dr + \int_s^t E_r(\bar{x}_r^h) - E_r(y) dr \Big\} \\ &\le \liminf_{h\to 0} \Big\{ Lh \int_s^t ||\dot{x}_r^h||^2 + ||\bar{x}_r^h - y||_r^2 \, dr + C_1 h \int_s^t (e(\bar{x}_r^h) + e(y)) dr \Big\} \\ &\le 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we applied Fatou's Lemma and the lower semicontinuity of $x \mapsto E_t(x)$ in the first inequality, estimate (68) in the third inequality and the non-negativity of $E_t(y)$, (51) and (52) in the last. Dividing by $t-s$ and letting $s \to t$ we infer from the Lebesgue differentiation theorem that

$$\langle \dot{x}_t, x_t - y\rangle_t + E_t(x_t) - E_t(y) \le 0$$

for almost every $t \in (0,T)$ and $y \in X$.

Since $\bar{x}_t^h$ converges to x_t for every t we clearly have that $\lim_{t\searrow 0} x_t = x$.

Suppose there exists two absolutely continuous curves (x_t), $(\tilde{x}_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ such that for every $y \in X$ and almost every $t \in [0,T]$

$$\langle \dot{x}_t, x_t - y\rangle_t + E_t(x_t) - E_t(y) \le 0,$$
$$\langle \dot{\tilde{x}}_t, \tilde{x}_t - y\rangle_t + E_t(\tilde{x}_t) - E_t(y) \le 0$$

with $\lim_{t\searrow 0} x_t = \lim_{t\searrow 0} \tilde{x}_t = 0$. Inserting $\tilde{x}_t$ for y into the first inequality and x_t for y into the second we obtain by adding and using (46)

$$\partial_s \frac{1}{2}||x_s - \tilde{x}_s||_t^2\Big|_{s=t} = \langle \dot{x}_t - \dot{\tilde{x}}_t, x_t - \tilde{x}_t\rangle_t \le 0.$$

From the log-Lipschitz continuity of the metric we deduce

$$\partial_s \frac{1}{2}||x_s - \tilde{x}_s||_s^2\Big|_{s=t} \le L||x_t - \tilde{x}_t||_t^2.$$

Applying Gronwall's inequality we conclude $||x_t - \tilde{x}_t||_t^2 \le e^{2Lt}||x_0 - \tilde{x}_0||_0^2 = 0$ for almost every $t \in [0,T]$ and hence for every $t \in [0,T]$ by continuity. This proves uniqueness. □

6 The heat equation on time-dependent metric measure spaces

Let $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ be a family of metric measure space, where X is a Polish space, each d_t is a complete geodesic metric and m_t is a σ-finite Borel measure. We always assume that (12) holds and that there exists a reference measure $m \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ such that $m_t = e^{-f_t}$ with Borel functions f_t satisfying $|f_t(x)| \le C$ and

$$|f_t(x) - f_s(x)| \le L^*|t-s|, \quad |f_t(x) - f_t(y)| \le C d_t(x,y). \tag{69}$$

Each static space (X, d_t, m_t) satisfies a curvature dimension condition $\mathrm{CD}(K, N')$ in the sense of [3, 20, 15] for some finite numbers K, N'.

Let us denote by $\mathrm{Ch}_t \colon L^2(X, m_t) \to [0,\infty]$ the *Cheeger's functional*

$$\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) = \frac{1}{2}\inf\left\{\liminf_{n\to\infty}\int_X (\mathrm{lip}_t u_n)^2 dm_t : u_n \in \mathrm{Lip}(X), \int |u_n - u|^2 dm_t \to 0\right\},$$

where $\mathrm{lip}_t u$ denotes the local slope. We recall that due to our asssumptions $L^2(X, m_t) = L^2(X, m_s)$ and $Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_t) = Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_s)$. By making use of the *minimal relaxed gradient* $|\nabla_t u|_*$ ([3, Definition 4.2]), this functional admits an integral representation

$$\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_X |\nabla_t u|_*^2 dm_t,$$

set equal to $+\infty$ if u has no relaxed slope. It defines a convex and lower semi-continuous functional in $L^2(X, m_t)$ [3, Theorem 4.5].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $u \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_t)$ and assume that (12) holds. Then*

$$|\nabla_t u|_* \le e^{L|t-s|}|\nabla_s u|_* \quad m-a.e.\ in\ X, \quad \forall s \in (0,T).$$

Proof. Since $u \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_t)$ we know $u \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_s)$ as well and there exist bounded Borel Lipschitz functions $u_n \in L^2(X, m_s)$ such that

$$u_n \to u, \quad |\nabla_s u_n| \to |\nabla_s u|_* \text{ strongly in } L^2(X, m_s),$$

see e.g. [3, Lemma 4.3 (c)]. This implies that $e^{L|t-s|}|\nabla_s u|_*$ is a relaxed d_t-gradient since

$$u_n \to u, \quad e^{L|t-s|}|\nabla_s u_n| \to e^{L|t-s|}|\nabla_s u|_* \text{ strongly in } L^2(X, m_t)$$

and

$$|\nabla_t u_n|_* \leq e^{L|t-s|}|\nabla_s u_n|,$$

c.f. [3, Lemma 4.3. (a)]. Thus Lemma 4.4 in [3] yields the assertion. □

The domain of the Cheeger's functional endowed with the norm

$$\sqrt{||f||^2_{L^2(X,m_t)} + \mathrm{Ch}_t(f)}$$

is a Banach space, cf. [7, Theorem 2.7]. In the following we additionally impose that for each t the space (X, d_t, m_t) satisfies a Riemannian Ricci lower bound, i.e. the Cheeger functional Ch_t defines a quadratic form and the domain is a Hilbert space, see [4]. In this case we will denote by $\mathcal{E}_t$ the associated *Dirichlet form*, which is the unique bilinear symmetric form satisfying

$$\mathcal{E}_t(u, u) = 2\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) \quad \forall u \in D(\mathrm{Ch}_t) \cap L^2(X, m_t).$$

Moreover $\mathcal{E}_t$ is strongly local [4, Proposition 4.14] and admits the integral representation

$$\mathcal{E}_t(u, v) = \int \nabla_t u \cdot \nabla_t v dm_t \quad u, v \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_t) \cap L^2(X, m_t),$$

where

$$\nabla_t u \cdot \nabla_t v := \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{|\nabla_t(u + \varepsilon v)|^2_* - |\nabla_t u|^2_*}{2\varepsilon}$$

and the limit is understood in $L^1(X, m_t)$, see [4, Proposition 4.14].

We define the Laplacian Δ_t as the generator of $\mathcal{E}_t$, i.e. as the unique non-positive self adjoint operator on $L^2(X, m_t)$ with domain $Dom(\Delta_t) \subset Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_t)$ and

$$-\int_X \Delta_t u v dm_t = \mathcal{E}_t(u, v) \quad \forall u \in Dom(\Delta_t), v \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_t) \cap L^2(X, m_t).$$

Due to our assumptions the sets $L^2(X, m_t)$ and $Dom(\mathrm{Ch}_t)$ do not depend on t. We set $\mathcal{F} = Dom(\mathcal{E})$ and $\mathcal{H} = L^2(X, m_t)$. We define for $0 \leq s < \tau \leq T$ the Hilbert space

$$\mathcal{F}_{(s,\tau)} = L^2((s, \tau \to \mathcal{F}) \cap H^1((s, \tau) \to \mathcal{F}^*),$$

equipped with the norm $(\int_s^\tau ||u_t||^2_{\mathcal{F}} + ||\partial_t u_t||^2_{\mathcal{F}^*} dt)^{1/2}$. According to Lemma 10.3 in [17] we have $\mathcal{F}_{(s,\tau)} \subset \mathcal{C}([s, \tau] \to \mathcal{H})$.

Definition 6.2. *A function u is called* solution to the heat equation

$$\partial_t u = \Delta_t u \text{ on } (s,\tau)\times X$$

if $u \in \mathcal{F}_{(s,\tau)}$ and if for all $v \in \mathcal{F}_{(s,\tau)}$

$$-\int_s^\tau \mathcal{E}_t(u_t, v_t)dt = \int_s^\tau \langle \partial_t u_t, w_t e^{-f_t}\rangle_{\mathcal{F}^*,\mathcal{F}} dt, \tag{70}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\mathcal{F}^*,\mathcal{F}}$ denotes the dual pairing.

A function v is called solution to the adjoint heat equation

$$-\Delta_s v + \partial_s f \cdot v = \partial_s v \qquad \text{on } (\sigma,t)\times X$$

if $v \in \mathcal{F}_{(\sigma,t)}$ and if for all $w \in \mathcal{F}_{(\sigma,t)}$

$$\int_\sigma^t \mathcal{E}_s(v_s, w_s)ds + \int_\sigma^t \int_X v_s \cdot w_s \cdot \partial_s f_s \, dm_s \, ds = \int_\sigma^t \langle \partial_s v_s, w_s e^{-f_s}\rangle_{\mathcal{F},\mathcal{F}^*} \, ds.$$

By virtue of Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.5 in [13] we have existence and uniqueness of the heat and the adjoint heat equation with initial condition $u_s = h \in \mathcal{H}$ and terminal condition $v_t = h \in \mathcal{H}$ respectively. We denote these solutions by

$$u_t(x) = P_{t,s}h(x), \qquad v_s(x) = P^*_{t,s}h(x).$$

Both propagators admit the following kernel representation

$$P_{t,s}h(x) = \int p_{t,s}(x,y)h(y)dm_s(y), \tag{71}$$

$$P^*_{t,s}h(y) = \int p_{t,s}(x,y)h(x)dm_t(x), \tag{72}$$

where $\int p_{t,s}(x,y)\, dm_s(y) = 1$, and $p_{t,r}(x,z) = \int p_{t,s}(x,y)p_{s,r}(y,z)\, dm_s(y)$.

6.1 Identification of the adjoint heat equation and the dynamic EDI-gradient flow for the entropy

Here we prove the identification of the adjoint heat equation and the dynamic EDI-gradient flow of (S_t). The strategy used here is the same as in [3]. We consider an adjoint heat flow $(\rho_t)_{0\le t\le T}$ parametrized forward in time with nonnegative initial data. We prove that the curve $\mu_t = \rho_t m_t$ is a dynamic EDI-gradient flow of (S_t). From the uniqueness it follows that both flows coincide.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $h \in \mathcal{H}$ and $\rho_s = P^*_{T,s}(h)$ be the solution to the adjoint heat flow.*

1. *The flow (ρ_s) is mass preserving, i.e.*

$$\int \rho_s \, dm_s = \int h \, dm_T = 1 \quad \forall s \le T. \tag{73}$$

2. *If $e\colon \mathbb{R} \to [0,\infty]$ is a convex lower semicontinuous function and e' is locally Lipschitz in $\mathbb{R}$, it holds for $\mathcal{L}^1$-a.e. s*

$$\frac{d}{ds}\int e(\rho_s)\, dm_s = \int e''(\rho_s)|\nabla_s \rho_s|^2_*\, dm_s + \int \partial_s f_s(\rho_s e'(\rho_s) - e(\rho_s))\, dm_s. \tag{74}$$

Proof. Since the measure is finite, $1 \in \mathcal{H}$, and hence

$$\int P^*_{T,s}\rho \, dm_s = \int P_{T,s}1\rho \, dm_T = \int \rho \, dm_T,$$

which shows the first assertion.

In order to prove (74) we assume by a standard approximation that e' is bounded and globally Lipschitz, cf. [3, Theorem 4.16]. Since e is convex and $\rho \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma,T}$ we have for $s_0 < s_1$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int e(\rho_{s_1}) \, dm_{s_1} - \int e(\rho_{s_0}) \, dm_{s_0} \\
&\geq \int e'(\rho_{s_0})(\rho_{s_1} - \rho_{s_0}) \, dm_{s_1} + \int e(\rho_{s_0}) \, d(m_{s_1} - m_{s_0}) \\
&= \int_{s_0}^{s_1} \langle \partial_s \rho_s, e'(\rho_{s_0}) e^{-f_{s_1}} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}^*,\mathcal{F}} \, ds - \int_{s_0}^{s_1} \int e(\rho_{s_0}) \partial_s f_s \, dm_s \, ds \\
&\geq \int_{s^0}^{s_1} \Big(-\frac{1}{2} ||\partial_s \rho_s||^2_{\mathcal{F}^*} - \frac{1}{2} ||e'(\rho_{s_0}) e^{-f_{s_1}}||^2_{\mathcal{F}} - \int_{s_0}^{s_1} \int e(\rho_{s_0}) \partial_s f_s \, dm_s \Big) ds,
\end{aligned}$$

which is integrable. Changing the roles of s_0 and s_1 shows that $s \mapsto \int e(\rho_s) \, dm_s$ is absolutely continuous. Then, since $\rho \in \mathcal{F}_{(\sigma,T)}$, we deduce from the mean value theorem for a.e. s

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{h} \Big(\int e(\rho_{s+h}) \, dm_{s+h} - \int e(\rho_s) \, dm_s \Big) \\
&= \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{h} \int (e(\rho_{s+h}) - e(\rho_s)) e^{-f_{s+h}} \, dm + \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{1}{h} \int e(\rho_s)(e^{-f_{s+h}} - e^{-f_s}) \, dm \\
&= \lim_{h \to 0} \int e'(\rho_s) \frac{\rho_{s+h} - \rho_s}{h} \, dm_s - \int e(\rho_s) \partial_s f_s \, dm_s \\
&= \langle \partial_s \rho_s, e'(\rho_s) e^{-f_s} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}^*,\mathcal{F}} - \int e(\rho_s) \partial_s f_s \, dm_s,
\end{aligned}$$

cf. [14, Corollary 5.5], [5, Lemma 12.3]. Since ρ is a solution to the adjoint heat equation we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \partial_s \rho_s, e'(\rho_s) e^{-f_s} \rangle_{\mathcal{F}^*,\mathcal{F}} &= \mathcal{E}_s(\rho_s, e'(\rho_s)) + \int \rho_s e'(\rho_s) \partial_s f_s \, dm_s \\
&= \int e''(\rho_s) |\nabla_s \rho_s|^2_* dm_s + \int \rho_s e'(\rho_s) \partial_s f_s \, dm_s,
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (74). □

Proposition 6.4. *Let $h \in \mathcal{H}$ be a nonnegative terminal datum and let (ρ_s) be the solution of the adjoint heat equation. Then it holds*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_s^T \int_{\{\rho_r > 0\}} \frac{|\nabla_r \rho_r|^2_*}{\rho_r} \, dm_r \, dr \leq \int h \log h \, dm_T - \int h \, dm_T \\
+ m_s(X) + \int_s^T \int (\partial_r f_r) \rho_r \, dm_r \, dr,
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

and the map $s \mapsto \int \rho_s \log \rho_s dm_s$ *is locally absolutely continuous in* $[0,T]$ *and*

$$\frac{d}{ds}\int \rho_s \log \rho_s \, dm_s = \int_{\{\rho_s>0\}} \frac{|\nabla_s \rho_s|_*^2}{\rho_s}\, dm_s + \int (\partial_s f_s)\rho_s \, dm_s \tag{76}$$

for a.e. $s \in [0,T]$.

Proof. Since all solutions satisfy a parabolic Harnack inequality, we have $\rho_t \geq 0$ for all $t \in (0,T)$, cf. [13, Theorem 3.5]. Applying formula (74) to $\rho_s + \varepsilon$ we get

$$\frac{d}{ds}\int (\rho_s+\varepsilon)\log(\rho_s+\varepsilon)\, dm_s = \int \frac{|\nabla_s \rho_s|_*^2}{\rho_s+\varepsilon}\, dm_s + \int \partial_s f_s (\rho_s+\varepsilon)\, dm_s.$$

Integrating from s to T and letting ε go to 0, we obtain by applying dominated and monotone convergence

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \rho_T \log \rho_T \, dm_T - \int \rho_s \log \rho_s \, dm_s \\ &= \int_s^T \int_{\{\rho_r>0\}} \frac{|\nabla_r \rho_r|_*^2}{\rho_r}\, dm_r + \int \partial_r f_r \rho_r \, dm_r \, dr. \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Using $\rho \log \rho \geq \rho - 1$ and the conservation of total mass (73) leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \int_t^T \int_{\{\rho_s>0\}} \frac{|\nabla_s \rho_s|_*^2}{\rho_s}\, dm_s \, ds \leq \int h \log h \, dm_T - \int h \, dm_T \\ + m_t(X) + \int_t^T \int \partial_s f_s \rho_s \, dm_s \, ds, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (75). As a consequence from (75) and (77) we get the local absolute continuity of $s \mapsto \int \rho_s \log \rho_s dm_s$ and (76). □

Proposition 6.5. *For* $\mu = \rho m_t \in Dom(S)$

$$|\nabla_t S_t|^2(\mu) \leq \int_{\{\rho>0\}} \frac{|\nabla_t \rho|_*^2}{\rho} dm_t.$$

Proof. Since each static space (X, d_t, m_t) satisfies $CD(K,\infty)$, Theorem 9.3 in [3] yields the assertion. □

Proposition 6.6. *Let* $(\rho_s)_{s\leq T}$ *be the solution to the adjoint heat equation with nonnegative terminal datum* $h \in \mathcal{H}$ *such that* $\int h \, dm_T = 1$. *Then the curve* $t \mapsto \mu_s := \rho_s m_s$ *is locally absolutely continuous and satisfies*

$$|\dot{\mu}_s|_s^2 \leq \int_{\{\rho_s>0\}} \frac{|\nabla_s \rho_s|_*^2}{\rho_s}\, dm_s \quad \text{for a.e. } s \in [0,T].$$

Proof. From (73) we know that $\int \rho_s \, dm_s = 1$ for every $s \leq T$. Hence each $\mu_s = \rho_s m_s$ is a probabilty measure.

Let $s < t$ and set $\delta := t - s$. Then, with $\vartheta(a) = s + a$, we define HLS_ϑ as in [13, Section 6] by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{HLS}_\vartheta := \Big\{ \varphi \in \mathrm{Lip}_b([0,\delta]\times X) \Big| \ \partial_a \varphi_a \leq -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{\vartheta(a)}(\varphi_a) \\ L^1 \times m \text{ a.e. in } (a_0,a_1)\times X \Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\tilde{W}^2_\vartheta(\mu_s,\mu_t) := 2\sup_\varphi \left\{ \int \varphi_\delta d\mu_t - \int \varphi_0 d\mu_s \right\},$$

where the supremum runs over all maps $\varphi(a,x) = \varphi_a(x) \in \mathrm{HLS}_\vartheta$. Then we have by Lemma 6.5 in [13]

$$W^2_s(\mu_s,\mu_t) \le e^{2L\delta}\delta \tilde{W}^2_\vartheta(\mu_s,\mu_{s+h}).$$

By applying [2, Lemma 4.3.4] to the function $(a,b) \mapsto \int \rho_a\varphi_b dm_a$, where $\varphi \in \mathrm{HLS}_\vartheta$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \varphi_\delta \, d\mu_t - \int \varphi_0 \, d\mu_s = \int_0^\delta \partial_a \int \varphi_a \, d\mu_{s+a} \, da \\
&\le \int_0^\delta \int -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{s+a}(\varphi_a) \, d\mu_{s+a} + \mathcal{E}_{s+a}(\rho_{s+a},\varphi_a) \, da \\
&\le \int_0^\delta \int -\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{s+a}(\varphi_a) \, d\mu_{s+a} \\
&+ \int \frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{s+a}(\varphi_a) \, d\mu_{s+a} + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\{\rho_{s+a}>0\}} \frac{\Gamma_{s+a}(\rho_{s+a})}{\rho_{s+a}} \, dm_{s+a} \, da \\
&= \int_0^\delta \frac{1}{2}\int_{\{\rho_{s+a}>0\}} \frac{\Gamma_{s+a}(\rho_{s+a})}{\rho_{s+a}} \, dm_{s+a} \, da.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over all φ

$$W^2_s(\mu_s,\mu_t) \le e^{2L\delta}\delta \int_0^\delta \int_{\{\rho_{s+a}>0\}} \frac{\Gamma_{s+a}(\rho_{s+a})}{\rho_{s+a}} \, dm_{s+a} \, da.$$

Dividing by δ^2 and letting $\delta \to 0$ we conclude

$$|\dot{\mu}_s|^2_s \le \int_{\{\rho_s>0\}} \frac{\Gamma_s(\rho_s)}{\rho_s} \, dm_s = \int_{\{\rho_s>0\}} \frac{|\nabla_s\rho_s|^2_*}{\rho_s} \, dm_s.$$

□

Now we are ready to prove our main result of this section.

Theorem 6.7. *Let $(X,d_t,m_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ be a family of Polish spaces with complete geodesic distances d_t satisfying (12) such that $m_t = e^{-f_t}m$, where $m \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ and f_t are bounded functions satisfying and (69). Assume that each static space satisfies RCD(K,N') for finite numbers $K,N' \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Let $h \in \mathcal{H}$ nonnegative with $\bar{\mu} = hm_T \in Dom(S)$. Then $\mu_t := P^*_{T,T-t}hm_{T-t}$ is the dynamic EDE-gradient flow for the relative entropy S_t starting in $\bar{\mu}$. Conversely, let μ_t be the EDE-gradient flow for S_t, then $\mu_t = \rho_t m_t$ and ρ_t is the solution to the adjoint equation parametrized forward in time.

Proof. Let $\rho_t = P^*_{T,T-t}(h)$. Proposition 6.4 applied the forward flow ρ_t yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int \rho_t \log\rho_t \, dm_t = -\int_{\{\rho_t>0\}} \frac{|\nabla_t\rho_t|^2_*}{\rho_t} \, dm_t + \int (\partial_t f_t)\rho_t \, dm_t.$$

Integrating from 0 to t and using Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 6.5 we obtain

$$S_t(\mu_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}_r|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r)dr \leq S_0(\bar{\mu}) + \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\mu_r)dr.$$

Moreover, by virtue of Proposition 2.11 in [13], $(\tilde{\mu}_t)$ is contained in the sublevel set of the entropy and hence, similarly as in the proof of Theorem 4.9, we get for all t

$$S_t(\mu_t) - S_0(\bar{\mu}) \geq \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\mu_r)dr - \int_0^t |\dot{\mu}|_r |\nabla_r S_r|(\mu_r)dr.$$

Thus we have

$$S_t(\mu_t) + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\dot{\mu}_r|_r^2 dr + \frac{1}{2}\int_0^t |\nabla_r S_r|^2(\mu_r)dr = S_0(\bar{\mu}) + \int_0^t (\partial_r S_r)(\mu_r)dr.$$

To show the converse implication, let $\tilde{\rho}_t = P^*_{T,T-t}(h)$ be the solution to the adjoint heat equation parametrized forward in time. From the previous argumentation we know that $\tilde{\mu}_t = \tilde{\rho}_t m_{T-t}$ is a dynamic EDE-gradient flow of the entropy. From Theorem 4.9 there is at most one gradient flow starting from $\bar{\mu}$, hence $\tilde{\mu}_t = \mu_t$ for every $t \in [0,T]$. □

6.2 Identification of the heat equation and the dynamic gradient flow for the Cheeger's energy

In the following let $(X, d_t, m_t)_{t\in[0,T]}$ be a family of Polish metric measure spaces. We suppose that (d_t) satisfies (12) and $m_t = e^{-f_t}m$, where m is a σ-finite Borel measure on X and (f_t) are Borel functions satisfying

$$|f_t(x) - f_s(y)| \leq L^*|t-s|. \tag{78}$$

We consider the Cheeger's functional $\mathrm{Ch}_t \colon L^2(X, m_t) \to [0,\infty]$, defined by

$$\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_X |\nabla_t u|_*^2 dm_t,$$

where $|\nabla_t u|_*$ denotes the minimal relaxed gradient of u. Since $L^2(X, m_t)$ is a separable Hilbert space and the assumptions on the energy functional from Section 5 are satified by $(\mathrm{Ch}_t)_t$ we directly obtain existence of a gradient flow in the sense of Definition 5.1.

Theorem 6.8. *Let $\bar{u} \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch})$. Then there exists a unique gradient flow for* Ch *starting in $\bar{u}$, i.e. an absolutely continuous curve $(u_t)_t$ solving*

$$\dot{u}_t \in -D_t^- \mathrm{Ch}_t(u_t) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0,T)$$

and $\lim_{t\to 0} u_t = \bar{u}$.

Proof. Obviously $\mathrm{Ch}_t \geq 0$ for every $t \in [0,T]$. Moreover $u \mapsto \mathrm{Ch}_t(u)$ is convex and lower semicontinuous by Theorem 4.5 in [3]. From Lemma 6.1 and (78) we

obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\mathrm{Ch}_t(u) - \mathrm{Ch}_s(u)| \le |\int |\nabla_t u|_*^2 - |\nabla_s u|_*^2 \, dm_t| + |\int |\nabla_s u|_*^2 \, d(m_t - m_s)| \\
&\le 2L|t-s| \int |\nabla_s u|_*^2 \, dm_t + L^* e^{L^*|t-s|}|t-s| \int |\nabla_s u|_*^2 \, dm_s \\
&\le 2L|t-s| e^{C|t-s|} \int |\nabla_s u|_*^2 \, dm_s + L^* e^{L^*|t-s|}|t-s| \int |\nabla_s u|_*^2 \, dm_s \\
&\le (2L + L^*) e^{L^*|t-s|}|t-s| \mathrm{Ch}_s(u).
\end{aligned}
$$

We get the result as a consequence of Theorem 5.5. □

In the case when the underlying space satisfies $\mathrm{RCD}(K, N')$ we may identify the gradient flow for the Cheeger's functional with the heat flow $\partial_t u_t = \Delta_t u_t$.

Theorem 6.9. *Let $\tilde{u}_t$ be the solution to the heat equation $\partial_t \tilde{u}_t = \Delta_t \tilde{u}_t$ on $(0,T) \times X$ starting in some $\bar{u} \in Dom(\mathrm{Ch})$. Then $\tilde{u}_t$ satisfies*

$$\dot{\tilde{u}}_t \in -D_t^- \mathrm{Ch}_t(\tilde{u}_t) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0,T),$$

and can be constructed as the limit of a minimizing movement scheme. Conversely, let u_t be the solution of the gradient flow of the Cheeger's functional Ch_t. Then u_t solves the heat equation

$$\partial_t u_t = \Delta_t u_t \text{ on } (0,T) \times X.$$

In particular $u_t = \tilde{u}_t$ in $L^2(X)$ for every $t \ge 0$.

Proof. Both flows satisfy the dynamic $\mathrm{EVI}(-L/2, \infty)$ gradient flow inequality almost everywhere by virtue of Proposition 5.2 and Theorem 2.5 in [13]. Hence from the contraction estimate [13, Theorem 7.7]

$$||u_t - \tilde{u}_t||_t^2 \le e^{L(t-s)} ||u_s - \tilde{u}_s||_s^2 \quad \text{for a.e. } t \ge s,$$

we obtain

$$||u_t - \tilde{u}_t||_t^2 \le \lim_{s \to 0} e^{L(t-s)} ||u_s - \tilde{u}_s||_s = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } t,$$

and hence by continuity $||u_t - \tilde{u}_t||_t = 0$ for every t. □

References

[1] Luigi Ambrosio and Nicola Gigli. A user's guide to optimal transport, 2011.

[2] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows in metric spaces and in the Space of Probabiliy Measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.

[3] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. Calculus and heat flow in metric measure spaces and applications to spaces with Ricci bounds from below. *Invent. Math.*, 195(2):289–391, 2013.

[4] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below. *Duke Math. J.*, 163(7):1405–1490, 2014.

[5] Luigi Ambrosio, Andrea Mondino, and Giuseppe Savaré. Nonlinear diffusion equations and curvature conditions in metric spaces. *arXiv:1509.07273*, 2015.

[6] V. Bogachev. *Measure Theory*, volume 1. Springer-Verlag, 2007.

[7] Jeff Cheeger. Differentiability of Lipschitz functions on metric measure spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 9(3):428–517, 1999.

[8] Matthias Erbar. The heat equation on manifolds as a gradient flow in the Wasserstein space. *Annales de l'I. H. P. Probabilités et Statistiques*, 46(1):1–23, 2010.

[9] Lucas Ferreira and Julio Valencia-Guevara. Gradient flows of time-dependent functionals in metric spaces and applications for PDE. *arXiv:1509.0416161v1*, 2015.

[10] Nicola Gigli. On the heat flow on metric measure spaces: existence, uniqueness and stability. *Calc. Var.*, 39(1-2):101–120, 2010.

[11] Nicola Gigli, Kazumasa Kuwada, and Shin-ichi Ohta. Heat flow on Alexandrov spaces. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 66(3):307–331, 2013.

[12] Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 29:1–17, 1998.

[13] Eva Kopfer and Karl-Theodor Sturm. Super-Ricci flows for Metric Measure Spaces. II. *arXiv:1611.02570*, 2016.

[14] Janna Lierl and Laurent Saloff-Coste. Parabolic Harnack inequality for time-dependent non-symmetric Dirichlet forms. *arXiv:1205.6493*, 2012.

[15] John Lott and Cédric Villani. Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 903–991, 2009.

[16] Shin-ichi Ohta and Karl-Theodor Sturm. Heat flow on Finsler manifolds. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 62(11):1386–1433, 2009.

[17] Michael Renardy and Robert C Rogers. *An introduction to partial differential equations*, volume 13. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[18] Riccarda Rossi, Alexander Mielke, and Giuseppe Savaré. A metric approach to a class of doubly nonlinear evolution equations and applications. *Ann. Sc. Norm. Super. Pisa Cl. Sci.*, 7:97–169, 2008.

[19] Riccarda Rossi and Giuseppe Savaré. Gradient flows of non convex functionals in Hilbert spaces. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 12:564–614, 2006.

[20] Karl-Theodor Sturm. On the geometry of Metric Measure Spaces. *Acta Math.*, 169(1):65–131, 2006.

[21] Karl-Theodor Sturm. Super Ricci flows for Metric Measure Spaces. I. *arXiv:1603.02193*, 2016.

[22] Peter Topping. *Lectures on the Ricci flow*, volume 325. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[23] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport, old and new.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2009.